DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 734 CE 031 009

AUTHOR	Nacson, Jacques; Kelly, Ella Mizzell
TITLE	Vocational Education: Meeting the Needs of Special Populations.
INSTITUTION	Nellum (A.L.) and Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C. Educational Policy and Organization Program.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	400-79-0012
NOTE	346p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; Community Colleges; Community Organizations; Coordination; *Disabilities; *Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Needs; English (Second Language); Learning Disabilities; National Surveys; Postsecondary Education; *Program Administration; Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; School Districts; Secondary Education; *Vocational Education; Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	Limited English Speaking; *Special Needs Students; Vocational Education Study

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to identify the vocational education needs of special populations and to describe the strategies used to meet the needs by public schools, community colleges, and community organizations. The case study method was used to collect data in 15 communities concerning the academically disadvantaged, the handicapped, the limited-English proficient, women, and Indians. Among the general findings are the following. (1) Local policy concerns are related to equity and quality of educational opportunities and greatest concern was with academic skills and proficiency requirements for graduation. (2) Definitions of special needs populations eligible for vocational education programs are the sole basis for defining their needs. (3) The planning process in general is of a short-term nature and lacks the coordination often evident at the community college level. (4) Planning activities at almost every location focuses exclusively on the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped. (5) Strategies used by local educational agencies are provided through their established student support system. (6) Rarely are there attempts to systematically assess the effects of various strategies and programs. (A more complete list of findings and descriptions are included. A special needs study concerning coordinating efforts is appended.) (BPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211734

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: MEETING THE NEEDS OF SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Prepared for:

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
under Contract No. NIE-400-79-0012
(ALNA #145)

By:

Jacques Nacson, Project Director
and
Ella Mizzell Kelly

A. L. NELLUM AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgments in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

Winter 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE031009

PREFACE

This report summarizes the findings of a national study of how and to what extent the vocational education needs of special populations--disadvantaged, handicapped, limited-English proficient, women, and Indians--were being met in various local communities. The study rationale, methodology, and the findings for each special needs populations are presented in greater detail in the final report of the project.

The overall purpose of the study was to identify and describe the vocational education strategies used by public schools, community colleges and community-based organizations to provide vocational education and training to special groups identified in the federal vocational education legislation. Field work consisted of a series of site visits to 15 communities, a metropolitan city, a mid-size community, and a rural area in each of five states; all participated in the study voluntarily.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank the staff of the public schools, the community colleges and the community-based organizations who voluntarily participated in the study. In particular, we wish to recognize the individuals at the districts and community colleges who so graciously and willingly gave their time for the coordination of field visits, identification of appropriate respondents and the conduct of interviews. The cooperation of each was vital to the study. A special note of thanks also goes to the parents and students we interviewed at the schools.

Rod Riffel of the NIE's Vocational Education Study provided assistance and encouragement throughout the course of this study. We appreciate as well the helpful comments made by Marc Hull, the CEIS representative of the Council of Chief State School Officers who reviewed the design for the study in preparation of forms for FEDAC approval.

The other members of the research team who did not participate in writing this final report nonetheless made valuable contributions to the study. They include Jennifer Bryce and Gloria Stokes. Their hard work and insight are greatly appreciated. Of course, responsibility for errors or misinterpretation rests solely with the authors.

Jacques Nacson
Ella Mizzell Kelly

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: MEETING THE NEEDS OF SPECIAL POPULATIONS

CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii
Acknowledgements.. iv
Executive Summary... v

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION....................................... 1

CHAPTER TWO: METHODS AND PROCEDURES............................. 9

CHAPTER THREE: THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.................... 19

CHAPTER FOUR: THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED..................... 67

CHAPTER FIVE: THE HANDICAPPED.................................... 95

CHAPTER SIX: LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS.................. 147

CHAPTER SEVEN: WOMEN... 173

CHAPTER EIGHT: INDIANS... 199

CHAPTER NINE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS............................ 207

APPENDIX: COORDINATED EFFORTS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVCIES TO SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS.......... 249

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH ISSUES

A. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Education Amendments of 1976 mandated that the National Institute of Education undertake a comprehensive study of vocational education programs conducted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, including a review of changes attributed to the 1976 legislation. In response to this Congressional charge, the National Institute of Education outlined a research strategy that combined both intramural and extramural research. Subsequently, the Institute contracted with A. L. Nellum and Associates, Inc., to conduct a study to examine the status of vocational education and services available in local communities for special needs populations identified in federal vocational and related legislation.

B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study, therefore, as specified by the National Institute of Education, was to learn how and to what extent the vocational education needs of special populations--academically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, handicapped, limited-English proficient (LEP), women, and Indians--were being met in local communities of different sizes and in different parts of the nation. More specifically, the study addressed the sponsor's broad research objectives by considering the following issues:

- Local Policies. The presence and nature of local policies affecting the delivery of vocational and occupational education services to special needs populations in public schools, community colleges, and other community-based institutions.

- Definitions. The definitions, data, and procedures used at the local community level to identify special needs groups, to assess their individual vocational needs and to provide them with vocational training and services.

- Planning. The methods for planning vocational education services and programs at the local level for special needs populations, including who is involved in the planning for the delivery of services; how needs are established and priorities set, and what the strategies are for obtaining and using the special needs funds.

- Strategies. Organizational and instructional strategies within community settings to meet the needs of special populations, such as intervention programs that offer direct educational and occupational training and related services to the special needs groups as well as those that may indirectly affect the quality of the services provided to those groups.

- Utilization of Resources. Use of resources of various kinds--information, materials, people, and dollars--that are available at the local level to support the various strategies and programs designed to service the special needs populations.

- Effects. Outcomes related to participation in special needs programs, as perceived by respondents in local communities.

While each of these issues could be examined in isolation, it was more important to understand how the sum of the activities within each organizational environment combined to produce or influence local decisions. Therefore, the process used by local communities to identify special needs populations and to plan and implement strategies/programs to meet their needs was examined in light of the vocational education legislation, the types of local programs available (e.g., special education, compensatory education and vocational education) and the contextual factors that influenced the policymaking, planning and delivery of services to special populations.

C. METHODOLOGY

The data for the study were collected in a series of field visits and interviews with respondents in 15 communities, three in each of five states. The sample included a metropolitan city, a mid-size community and a rural area in the states of California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. These represented the five "core" states common to the other substudies conducted for the National Institute of Education's Vocational Education Study. Because the emphasis was on developing a profile of how each community responded to the vocational needs of its special groups, open-ended interviews were conducted with respondents at the following levels: local educational agencies (LEAs), community colleges and community-based organizations (CBOs) that provided training and employment services to special needs groups or whose representatives acted as advocates for the special populations.

At the LEA level, interviews were conducted with board members, superintendents and their key deputies, directors of vocational education, supervisors in charge of counseling and work-study youth programs, compensatory education, special education, bilingual education, sex equity and, in one district, Indian education. In addition, at the school level, principals, vocational supervisors, teachers, and guidance counselors as well as parents and students contributed information related to the issues of interest to the study.

At the community colleges, respondents included members of boards of trustees, deans of instruction and occupational education, directors, and supervisors of special needs instructional programs (e.g., English as a Second Language, CETA-supported skills centers, training programs for the handicapped) as well as support service programs (e.g., guidance, financial aid, media, and resource centers). In some instances, group rather than individual interviews were conducted because of time and scheduling constraints. Finally, community-based respondents interviewed at each site included minimally a member of the local advisory council for vocational education, often an employer in the community, a representative of the CETA prime sponsor in the area, and a representative of the local office of the Department of Rehabilitation. The number of respondents interviewed affiliated with CBOs providing training and employment services to special groups as well as those acting on their behalf varied considerably depending on the size of the community and the concentration of special needs populations.

Two strategies were used to report and analyze the data collected from each site. First, the information from each interview was coded by respondent type and was summarized on 5 by 8 data cards according to the six major issues of concern to the sponsor. Second, the interview teams wrote individual site profiles that summarized the information obtained from respondents at the school district, the community college and the CBOs providing vocational/occupational services in that community. In preparing the final report, the team drew principally on the descriptive, narrative portion of each profile, summarizing and highlighting the major points emerging from the qualitative analysis. No attempts were made to quantify the data since the major research objective was to describe the range of vocational strategies and options available to special needs populations in the communities studied. A summary of the findings is presented below.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The exploratory study of local vocational education options for special needs populations addressed six major issues that provided a framework for the field work: the presence of local policies affecting the delivery of services and the vocational options available to special populations; the definitions and methods used to identify the special groups; the methods for planning programs to meet the needs of the subpopulations; the strategies and/or program characteristics of special needs efforts; the resources were applied to support the programs; and the effects of the special needs programs as perceived by the respondents. This section summarizes the most important findings of the study for each of these issues as they relate to the special needs populations and the types of institutions visited.

A. LOCAL POLICIES

1. School Districts.

The major policy concerns of most LEAs visited were related to equity and quality of educational opportunities for all students, usually defined in terms of academic skills and proficiency requirements for graduation. Such policies had implications for students who were designated as "special needs" and who wanted to participate in vocational education programs. For example, to the extent that special needs students met the minimum academic standards, usually measured by standardized tests, they could expect to participate in the vocational education programs of their choice. However, to the degree that they displayed serious academic difficulties, they could not participate in the regular vocational education programs unless "special" programs existed to meet their needs and sufficient numbers of slots in the programs were available to accommodate the student demand.

Rarely did boards of education address policies specifically related to vocational education for students in general or for special needs populations in particular. Where such policies existed, they were usually implicit and in response to federal and state categorical legislative mandates, unrelated to the provisions of the VEA. Moreover, the state and federal statutes rarely affected local policy development; more often they affected the nature of the administrative and instructional procedures to be followed in identifying and providing service to the special needs groups. For instance, procedures for identifying and providing services to special education students emanated from the provisions of state and federal legislations regarding the education of all handicapped children. This was also the case for services provided to academically disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged students, for whom procedures and guidelines had been established according to federal ESEA, Title I legislation, CETA-sponsored in-school youth work experience programs as well as state compensatory mandates. In a few instances, policies were also implicitly established as a result of consent decrees when suits had been initiated against local school boards on behalf of certain classes of special needs students. This was the case in New York City regarding the provision of bilingual vocational education services for Hispanic students.

The special needs subpopulations of greatest concern to LEAs were the academically disadvantaged, then the handicapped. Of lesser concern were the LEP students. There appeared to be little policy concern or initiative affecting services for female students and Indians. With regard to the latter, few if any Indians were among the populations represented in each of the districts visited.

Given the attention to the academically disadvantaged, whose numbers especially in larger metropolitan areas tended to be sizable, implementation of LEA policies regarding their special needs often resided in the highest administrative offices of the school district. Nevertheless, vocational educators were seldom involved in the development of policies regarding these groups, although they were often affected by the implementation of such policies.

For example, as regards the academically disadvantaged, if there was a strong compensatory education thrust within the state and within the LEA, then provisions for compensatory education services took precedence over all other elective programs. Because vocational education was considered an elective, the greater the need for compensatory education services and the larger the population requiring these services, the less opportunity for those students to participate in vocational education programs. On the other hand, for those who were severely academically disadvantaged, there was often the tendency for central administrators to view vocational education as their only option, since they would probably experience continued failure in regular academic offerings. Under these circumstances, the students would be channeled into "separate" and/or "special" vocational education programs, if available in the districts.

2. Community Colleges.

Community colleges, because they viewed their continued existence as interwoven with their ability to demonstrate their responsiveness to their respective local communities, had developed policies that were service-oriented. In most cases, the policies were stated in terms of general goals and objectives guided by the philosophy of meeting the post-secondary educational needs of all students. Nevertheless, college administrators, policymakers, and staffs spent considerable time undertaking detailed assessments to identify the needs of the special populations and to ensure that program planning and implementation were commensurate to their service-oriented philosophy. Moreover, because student enrollment in vocational programs often represented 50 percent or more of the total college enrollment, occupational deans and staff were very much involved in the formulation of policies and the development of programs and services to meet the needs of special student populations.

In contrast to the LEAs, community colleges were doing much to make educational equity a reality in terms of access to services for the special needs populations. In addition, personnel of community colleges often participated in policy development for other community-based organizations or areas such as CETA and local and state advisory councils for vocational education but were seldom involved in policy formulation on LEA boards.

3. Community-Based Organizations.

The policy guidelines for programs administered by organizations linked to the CETA system and/or the state Departments of Rehabilitation were based on the provisions of the respective federal legislation. Most organizations were committed to addressing the employment and education needs of some or all of the subgroups of the special needs populations. This was especially true of CETA programs, whose focus, though on income and employment status, cut across the various special needs subpopulations of this study. In each instance, researchers were able to identify policies addressing the need for some form of career/occupational/vocational training as a condition for securing competitive employment.

While many of the community-based organizations were linked to the CETA system as subcontractors, few used any VEA funds for services provision. According to some respondents who had attempted to tap this source of funding, the application process was so unwieldy as to discourage, rather than encourage, their efforts.

B. DEFINITIONS, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT

1. School Districts.

For almost all school districts, the special needs populations eligible for vocational education services were defined according to the established procedures used to identify them. These procedures, however, were very largely shaped by state and federal legislation unrelated to the specific provisions of the national VEA. For example, identification of the academically disadvantaged students was determined in most cases by procedures prescribed by ESEA, Title I legislation, as well as state compensatory aid legislation, especially in states that had instituted proficiency testing. For the economically disadvantaged, identification was according to eligibility guidelines set in the CETA legislation; for the handicapped, it was according to P.L. 94-142, which detailed the processes for definition, identification, placement, planning, and evaluation for all handicapped children.

None of these individual pieces of state and federal legislation addressed the issue of vocational education, though each did address a subset of the special needs population targeted to receive services and was referenced by the vocational education legislation. The results of this referencing process, however, was that the vocational educational needs of the students were rarely assessed since the identification occurred before placement in the vocational programs. Thus, contrary to the intent of the VEA that services be provided to increase the prospects for success in regular vocational education programs, issues addressed by the varying identification processes focused on the academic and other non-work-related needs of the special groups.

In fact, the academic-related identification and assessment procedures used by most school districts tended to limit the vocational options available to special needs students. In most instances, placement of special needs populations appeared to be contingent on performance in basic competency areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Students who failed to achieve a level of acceptable competency in these basic skills were placed in compensatory or remedial programs. Such placement usually reduced the likelihood of participation by subgroups of special needs students in regular vocational education programs. Or, to the contrary, if these subgroups were viewed as not being capable of achieving success in regular academic or vocational programs, they might be placed in "separate" or "special" vocational programs.

Rarely did LEAs consider in the placement process factors such as students' vocational competencies and interests first and academic achievement second. As a result, the use of other than VEA legislatively prescribed procedures conflicted with the intended outcome of the vocational education legislation to provide services needed to overcome "handicaps which prevent success in regular vocational education programs."

A number of limitations were noted as well regarding district procedures and instruments currently used to define and identify some subgroups of the special needs populations. This was particularly the case for students who had serious academic problems and those with limited proficiency in English.

Concerning the severely academically disadvantaged students, school administrators were often uncertain about their identification and placement. The degree to which the students also manifested social, behavorial, and emotional problems exacerbated the difficulties. Thus, for example, students most likely to be identified as "educationally handicapped" might be considered by some LEAs as "academically disadvantaged" and receive services, under ESEA, Title I, but as "handicapped" (learning disabled or even educable mentally retarded) and receive services under P.L. 94-142 by another. Equally noteworthy was the fact that many students particularly affected by this apparent confusion concerning definition seemed to be minority males, usually Black and Hispanic.

With regard to LEP students, school administrators claimed that there was no need for bilingual vocational programs since most students graduating from the elementary and junior high schools knew enough English to follow the regular high school vocational curriculum and were, therefore, no longer identified as LEP. On the other hand, some advocates for the Hispanic community in particular, claimed that bilingual vocational education programs were very much needed and pointed to the high dropout rates among Hispanic youth at the high school level as an indicator for such need. They also noted that English as a Second Language (ESL) instructions had to be provided by many CETA and other community-based programs serving the employment and training needs of Hispanic citizens.

Complicating the problem of identification for the LEP population was the fact that, in many sites, testing was done in English only, not both in English and the students' native languages. As a result, school administrators often identified LEP students as "academically disadvantaged" when their performance in English reading, writing, and mathematics was below the minimum requirements. Often, these students would be programmed then for compensatory and remedial classes with other native English-speaking students. Hence, it was not unusual that, especially in large metropolitan areas, classes of students identified as "academically disadvantaged" were heavily minority persons, racially and ethnically.

2. Community Colleges.

In contrast to the LEAs, at the community colleges, the identification of special needs students occurred on two levels--before and after their placement in regular occupational programs. Thus, the opportunities existed for providing to special needs students vocationally related services and programs designed to meet their specific needs. For most students, identification of special needs and initial placement in programs occurred at the point of entry to the college. Generally, based on review of records and performance on entrance exams, students were advised of their status at the time of acceptance of the application for admission. For those with serious needs, e.g., the academically disadvantaged, many were urged to attend pre-entrance programs that might be beneficial. Moreover, the students were assigned to a guidance counselor, who, at the time of entry, reviewed with the student his or her interests, performance on standardized measures such as the SAT and ACT, and other appropriate data, in order to identify the best match of courses, curricula, and instructors.

In addition, a "back-up" system existed for students who were "transfers," late applicants, and those experiencing difficulty shortly after placement in academic and occupational classes. Students had the option of altering their programs or seeking individualized help provided through the college resource centers. Typically, the guidance and counseling process for the special needs populations provided specialized assistance to the students in an attempt to address their specific and individualized needs.

3. Community-Based Organizations.

Community-based organizations, particularly those supported by CETA and Vocational Rehabilitation, defined and identified their clients according to provisions of their respective federal legislation. For CETA programs, income requirements were the primary criteria for eligibility. Eligibility for vocational rehabilitation services, on the other hand, required that an individual have a disability that resulted in a substantial handicap to employment and that a "reasonable expectation" existed that the person could get and hold a job as a result of the services provided.

Most agency representatives were very concerned about evaluation of the services provided and their ability to place clients successfully in jobs. Program directors and program staff indicated that, although the sponsoring agencies provided support for their efforts, the overemphasis on "successful" placements forced subcontractors to screen out clients who were least likely to succeed in order to achieve their placement goals and be eligible for continued funding.

As long as the total population eligible for services was greater than those for whom services would be provided, most subcontractors could easily comply with the differing federal regulations and at the same time meet the evaluation criteria applied by the state and local administering agencies. However, the increased focus on effectiveness as measured by successful placements regardless of other functions such as clients' readiness for training and employment led to differentiations among eligible populations based on academic considerations.

C. PLANNING

1. School Districts.

Planning for vocational services to special needs populations activities at most LEAs focused almost exclusively on the needs of the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped; there was little or no evidence of planning activities related to participation of the other subgroups of special needs population in vocational education. The major findings related to female students in nontraditional programs, LEP students, Indians and economically disadvantaged students are presented first, followed by a more detailed description of planning activities for academically disadvantaged students and handicapped students.

Although most school districts had a Sex Equity Director, usually more than one responsibility was assigned to that individual; issues related to equity were considered secondary to his/her other roles. Moreover, school administrators' attitudes were that "aggressive" outreaching to female students to participate in "nontraditional" vocational education programs (and vice versa for male students) would alienate local residents who were always described as "conservative."

With regard to LEP students, bilingual administrators seemed to be more concerned with the institutionalization of bilingual academic programs than the establishment of separate bilingual vocational programs. Vocational educators, on the other hand, pointed to the lack of resources, especially qualified bilingual vocational staff, to plan and develop special programs for LEP students. They also noted that most LEP students in their districts knew enough English by the time they reached the high school level to participate successfully in the regular English monolingual programs.

At each of the sites visited, the population of Indian students was very small. Therefore, little or no planning activities were directed toward this special needs group. Even at the one site where officials acknowledged the presence of such population, the major planning focus was on academically and culturally related activities targeted to students in the elementary grades.

Finally, some planning activities were extant for the economically disadvantaged subgroup of students. However, planning was related primarily to the operation of the work experience programs under the in-school youth programs funded by CETA. It should be noted, however, that almost all of these programs were very small, usually accommodating a few students per school (five to ten), and seldom providing slots sufficient to meet the demands of all students who were economically disadvantaged and needed to work. In addition, in some cases, the activities involved were less "planning" than monitoring/supervision of in-school youth at work sites in the schools; local CETA youth officials generally planned the activities with a district representative, which were then administered by local school building supervisors.

Planning for Academically Disadvantaged. Partly because the size of the academically disadvantaged tended to be very large and, because LEA policies stressed the development of basic skills proficiency standards, when school administrators talked about the "disadvantaged," invariably they meant the "academically disadvantaged." Thus, the VEA funds available were used in most cases to support services for academically rather than economically disadvantaged students. Planning for the use of the funds, however, was done by vocational educators, usually independently of any planning undertaken by central office administrators who administered other state and federal compensatory education funds for the disadvantaged. Therefore, the efforts, although directed toward the same target populations, were usually separate and uncoordinated.

Planning activities related to the use of the VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged occurred at two levels: central administration and the local school building site. At central headquarters, vocational directors working with school principals and vocational supervisors (in large districts) had major administrative responsibility for establishing program priorities and for developing strategies for the distribution of the funds. Typically, the set-aside funds were divided equitably among the high schools in the district that offered vocational programs based on such factors as enrollment, academic performance of students, types of vocational programs offered, and condition of existing equipment. The exceptions identified were in large metropolitan areas where, in some cases, the funds for the disadvantaged were used to support "separate" programs or, alternatively, the allocations were made competitively on the basis of school proposals submitted to the central office.

At the local building level, program planning for use of the VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged was usually under the leadership of the building principal. Here, the principal usually worked with the chair of the vocational education department and vocational education teachers, as well as the vocational guidance counselors, in planning for actual use of the funds. In general, the building principals had a great deal of flexibility and authority regarding these planning activities as well as the allocation of funds. The only requirement was that the school be able to document the number of academically disadvantaged students who benefited from the activities supported by VEA dollars.

Planning for the Handicapped. Unlike the planning efforts for the "disadvantaged," which were often characterized as independent and at times redundant, planning efforts for the handicapped population tended to display some collaboration between vocational educators and special education administrators. The process usually began when vocational educators in central administrative offices informed the special education administrators of the size of the allocations of the set-asides for the handicapped population.

Special education administrators, working with building principals, would then plan separately for the use of these funds and, later, would meet with vocational educators to review the plans and to discuss issues concerning their implementation. Because special educators were responsible for administration of P.L. 94-142 funds, often VEA-related programs for the handicapped were coordinated with support services already available in the schools. Depending on the nature of the VEA programs proposed for handicapped students, discussions with the vocational education director and supervisors might focus on (1) recruitment of vocational educators for the separate vocational programs, (2) purchase of new shop equipment or modification of existing equipment for the programs, and (3) allocation of space and the organization of the separate shop facilities in the schools. In effect then, interactions between vocational and special educators at the central level were most apparent during the program implementation phase rather than during the needs assessment or program development phases.

At the local building level, special education adminstrators spent much of their time with the staff in an effort to gain their cooperation and assistance in operating special programs for the handicapped or to overcome their reluctance to "mainstream" handicapped students in the regular vocational programs. With regard to planning, the activities focused primarily on the development of Individualized Education Plans for the students and the monitoring of those plans. Special education teachers and school support staff most directly involved with the education of the handicapped students were the key participants in this planning process; vocational education staff were rarely involved.

Outside Participation in Planning. In general, there was little outside participation in the planning activities related to LEA vocational education services and programs for any of the special needs populations. Typically, the role of the Local Advisory Councils for Vocational Education was limited and specific. Representation on the councils tended to come from the employment, labor and business sectors; rarely were special needs populations represented. Essentially, the advisory groups provided vocational educators with detailed information about employment projections for local industries and about related manpower needs; they were also useful in facilitating the placement of students in vocational work experience and work training programs. At the school building level, outside participation in the planning related to vocational education in general, and vocational education for any of the special needs populations was limited to parental and community participation through the local PTA. Then, such participation was a function of the relationship between the local PTA and the school administration.

2. Community Colleges.

Vocational education program planning for special needs populations within community colleges tended to be characterized by collaborative efforts among staff and between the college community and the local community. Within the college itself, the needs assessment process tended to be ongoing; as problems were identified, the cross section of the college community involved in their potential resolution would be requested to assist in helping to find solutions. Given these procedures, most colleges had developed core programs that were seen as essential to meeting the basic needs of the various sets of special needs populations (e.g., remedial classes for the academically disadvantaged, financial aid for the economically disadvantaged, support services and outreach for the handicapped, etc.); these were augmented with auxiliary and ancillary services needs categories (e.g., displaced homemaker programs for older women who were single heads of households, readers for the handicapped who were blind, etc.). The collaborative process required that all participants keep each other informed of the newly identified needs of the various special needs populations as well as the services and programs available to meet those needs.

In addition, community colleges made extensive use of representatives from the local communities as advisors to each of their departments and special committees. This local representation was important in terms of the college's demonstration of its responsiveness to the local community, whose tax dollars paid for part of its support, as well as a means of tapping the various information bases about possible alternatives for problem resolution. Representation on the various advisory boards tended to include groups and agencies as diverse as the local CETA prime sponsor, the state Department of Rehabilitation, the employment community, labor, community-based advocacy groups for the disadvantaged, women, minorities, and the handicapped.

3. Community-Based Organizations.

Community-based organizations usually planned their activities according to a set of specific factors: clients' needs, employment needs/projections for the service area in which they were located, and requirements prescribed either by legislation, if a CETA-sponsored organization, or by their charter and/or board of directors, if a private, nonprofit organization.

For CETA-sponsored organizations, planning activities occurred at two levels: the prime sponsor and the local organization. At the prime sponsor level, planning activities focused on the quantity and quality of the clientele serviced, procedures for identifying program priorities, strategies for distributing funds, and processes for evaluating institutional efforts. Most prime sponsor representatives interviewed stated that in planning for their operations, they attempted to incorporate the participation of a broad spectrum of the local community to ensure that the needs of the various sets of special needs populations would be addressed within the organizational structure. The local Employment and Training Councils were the forums in which this cross-spectrum was represented and involved employers, labor, industry, public service organizations, post-secondary institutions, and the local education agency.

At the second level of the CETA system, individual organizations planned for the delivery of service to the various clients who came to them. Most had independent boards of directors to which they were responsible, and many of the boards played an active role in planning the variety of programs for their constituencies. At this level, organizations focused on the specifics of client identification and outreach, assessment of individual client needs, tailoring of services to client needs, job placement, and administrative issues such as payment of stipends, submission of reports in a timely manner to the prime sponsor, and the prime sponsor's evaluation of the services provided by the organization.

D. STRATEGIES

1. School Districts

The examination of vocational education strategies used at the LEA level to serve the needs of special populations identified the vocational options typically available in the schools for each subpopulation of students and the ways in which the set-asides were used to provide services, including the characteristics of those services.

a. Vocational Options for Special Needs Populations

Two observations with regard to vocational options for special needs students at the public school level were consistent across sites. First, the number of special needs students participating in regular programs was relatively small, and, second VEA-related options affected only two of the special needs groups identified in the federal legislation--the academically disadvantaged and handicapped. The major findings related to vocational options are presented separately for each population.

Academically Disadvantaged. In general, two separate groups of academically disadvantaged students were identified, especially in large metropolitan and mid-size communities: (1) those who were slightly below national norms on standardized, norm-referenced or proficiency tests and (2) those who were severely academically disadvantaged; that is, students who were two or more years below grade level, had been retained in grades, and had exhibited discipline or behavior problems and who were very likely to drop out of school before graduation.

With regard to the former population of students, many of the districts' new academic course and proficiency standards for graduation as well as the technical vocational program entry requirements tended to exclude students from participating in regular vocational programs. To obtain a regular high school diploma, many were forced to drop vocational education and take additional remedial academic courses in an effort to pass the proficiency exams.

Options for the more severely academically disadvantaged students were more clearly defined. Typically, they were excluded from regular vocational education courses. In districts in which separate vocationally oriented programs were available, students were counseled and placed in these alternative programs, which, in most cases, did not lead to a regular diploma. Although, often the alternative vocational programs were more relevant to their needs than most academic courses, the vocational options available were more limited than those in the regular vocational programs.

Separate, alternative programs, often supported with VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged, were not offered by every school district, however. In general, these programs seemed to be available in the larger LEAs, particularly in those states that provided categorical funds for compensatory and alternative programs for academically disadvantaged students. In school districts where such funds and programs were not available, severely academically disadvantaged students seemed to be placed in general curriculum courses rather than vocational or academic. Many of these students were apt to drop out of school before graduation and were likely candidates for the CETA training and employment programs in the community.

Economically Disadvantaged. Economically disadvantaged students participated in regular vocational education programs to the extent that they could meet the district's academic graduation standards and vocational program entry requirements. None of the school districts visited offered VEA-related instructional programs or guidance services designed to help economically disadvantaged students overcome the effects of their condition. Often, the reason indicated for the lack of such programs was the size of the academically disadvantaged student population in the school. Because in each district, the VEA set-aside allocation for disadvantaged students was generally small and the needs of the academically disadvantaged students were so great, most all of the district's VEA categorical funds targeted to the disadvantaged were used to supplement services to the academically disadvantaged. Respondents typically noted that many who were academically disadvantaged were also economically disadvantaged. Thus, in effect, they were serving the needs of this population as well.

The only option generally available to economically disadvantaged students was work experience programs funded primarily through CETA youth programs and, in a few cases, VEA funds. The number of slots available in most cases was less than the eligible population. Moreover, the purposes of the programs were to provide world of work experiences to the students and a stipend to encourage the students to graduate from high school. Most of the students were placed in low-skill, low-paying jobs. In a few cases, the programs offered career guidance and employability skills. Rarely, however, did the employment programs provide skill training, or were they related to the regular vocational courses.

Handicapped. The most prevalent strategy for servicing handicapped students was to place them in separate programs that had been established by most school districts for students who exhibited certain types of disabilities. Two types of programs were identified: academic and vocational self-contained programs within the comprehensive high schools for minimally handicapped students (primarily the educable mentally retarded) and self-contained programs in separate centers for the severely (the trainable mentally retarded) and multiple-handicapped students. In a few instances, a third strategy was identified, which involved provision of resource laboratory type services to "mainstreamed" learning disabled and some emotionally impaired students.

Typically, handicapped students were categorized on the basis of formal identification process and were then channeled automatically into one of these program options. In effect, then, the placement process depended more on group classification of the students' disabilities than on individual assessments of vocational strengths and interests. In all cases, the vocational options available to handicapped students in the separate programs were more limited than the offerings available to non-handicapped students in regular programs. Moreover, the occupational options available to students in the separate programs varied from site to site depending on the program's vocational orientation. In some cases, where the vocational courses were taught by certified vocational teachers, there appeared to be serious efforts to provide handicapped students with salable entry-level skills. Conversely, when the separate programs were staffed totally by non-vocationally oriented teachers, the focus was on helping students develop academic competencies and appropriate general work habits rather than specific occupational skills. Consistent with this philosophy, preparation for employment consisted solely of work experiences unrelated to vocational training.

The small numbers of handicapped students "mainstreamed" into regular vocational programs were mostly the physically disabled whose disabilities did not impair their ability to perform in the classrooms or shops. In addition, a few sensory disabled, particularly the hard-of-hearing and some students who had language impairments, were "mainstreamed" in certain vocational programs, such as Welding, where their handicaps did not interfere with the task requirements.

Perhaps the least well served handicapped students were the learning disabled and the emotionally impaired. In addition to the difficulties in identifying and assessing their needs, school administrators had considerable difficulties related to appropriate school and program placement. Often, when resource type services were not available in the high schools, these students were placed inappropriately in the self-contained separate programs housed in the schools. Rarely were these students "mainstreamed" into the regular vocational classes since vocational educators seemed to be particularly careful to screen out potential troublemakers who might create disruptive situations.

Limited-English Proficient. With regard to this population, respondents across sites noted that few LEP students participated in the regular vocational classes because the total population attending the high schools was small. They argued that LEP students who had graduated from elementary and junior high school bilingual programs knew enough English at the time they entered high schools to be able to follow successfully the monolingual English vocational curriculum. Because most of these students were no longer identified as LEP, special services or programs for them were not necessary.

Women. Although all school district representatives noted that there were no sex restrictions affecting student placement into any of their vocational curriculum courses, with a few exceptions, most of the female students seemed to be participating in traditionally female-oriented courses. None of the LEAs visited had made concerted district-wide efforts to encourage female participation in nontraditional programs. Thus, although each district appeared to comply with federal and state sex equity guidelines, the strategy used was clearly passive. Respondents at various sites pointed to the conservative nature of their constituents, and most feared the consequences likely to result from taking a more active role on this sensitive issue.

A few LEAs, cooperating with the community college in their district, provided workshops for graduating female students in an effort to disseminate information about opportunities for vocational education in nontraditional areas at the college. In most cases, however, arrangements seemed to have been initiated by representatives of the community college rather than by those at the LEAs.

Indians. Except for one, none of the LEAs visited had a substantial number of Indian students enrolled in the schools. Even in the one district that was the exception, however, most of the students enrolled seemed to be concentrated in the elementary grades rather than the high schools. Therefore, no VEA-related strategy existed to provide services to this special needs population. According to the Indian education director, many of the students dropped out of high school before graduating and either returned to the reservation nearby or sought services from the few community-based agencies that had been established specifically to serve their needs in that community.

b. Strategies for Use of VEA Set-Asides.

As indicated, VEA funded programs for special needs populations were generally targeted to the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped students in the schools. The programs for these students were usually separate from the regular vocational programs; although less common, strategies to provide supplementary services to academically disadvantaged or handicapped students participating in the regular programs were also observed.

The strategy of separate special needs programs was most clearly identified with respect to handicapped students. In most every instance in which an LEA was allotted VEA set-aside funds for the handicapped, school personnel could identify separate special needs projects that were supported, often initiated, with the vocational funds. In many cases, the funds had been used by special education administrators as an incentive to principals for establishing vocationally oriented programs for handicapped students in their schools. Thus, although the strategies did not supplement services to "mainstreamed" handicapped students, the effect was to increase the vocational education opportunities for some of the handicapped students in the districts. The two exceptions encountered consisted of (1) the establishment of vocational evaluation centers (two sites) to assess objectively handicapped students' strengths and interest, thereby facilitating their placement in regular programs and (2) the use of interpreters (one site) to assist hard-of-hearing students participating in a Welding program.

With regard to VEA services to academically disadvantaged students, the strategies were less clear. In the case of school districts that offered separate alternative programs, VEA funds were usually used to support program activities in those centers. Decisions related to the expenditure of funds were made by local administrators, although, in most cases, it appeared that the funds contributed to the purchase of materials and equipment for the vocational shops.

In cases where the funds were distributed to the various high schools on the basis of factors such as total vocational enrollment, academic achievement of students, etc., the principals and school vocational staff often determined how the funds were to be used. Thus, the strategies used varied considerably and included purchasing material and equipment for individualized instructions, hiring school aides, and, in some cases, hiring or supporting teachers of remedial reading and math. Often, in such cases, teachers provided remedial reading and math instructions to academically disadvantaged students in vocational as well as in other curriculum courses. As a result, most schools followed the practice of documenting, for auditing purposes, the nature of the services provided to academically disadvantaged students enrolled in vocational courses.

Most of the separate, special needs programs included some form of work experience. The experiences, however, were usually designed to orient the students to the general world of work and were not part of the cooperative vocational education programs run by most schools for students in the regular programs. Thus, unlike the regular vocational students, the special needs students were usually placed in positions unrelated to their specific area of training.

Finally, none of the school districts visited had opted either to support staff development programs or to implement curriculum modifications as VEA-related strategies for meeting the needs of special populations participating in vocational education. In a few instances, vocational education teachers had attended state-sponsored workshops that provided some guidance for teaching handicapped students. Curriculum modifications, on the other hand, were limited primarily to the initiatives of individual teachers. In only two of the 15 cases were systematic attempts made to modularize the vocational education curricula so that special needs students could participate and master skills at their own learning pace without being constrained by an "all or none" philosophy or requirement. In this respect, teachers and administrators were reluctant to modifiy state curriculum requirements since a major criteria for state evaluation, credentialling, and continued funding of vocational programs was the percentage of "successful placements" of student graduates.

2. Community Colleges.

The most prevalent community college strategy for providing services to special needs populations was through the colleges' established student support systems. These included financial and career guidance and placement centers, guidance departments, the media, resource and tutorial centers, student activity offices, health centers, and, in most colleges, the recently formed exceptional student centers. Often, the deans of occupational education using the VEA set-aside funds would contribute to the activities provided through the centers so that particular attention was given by the staff to the special needs of the target students enrolled in occupational programs.

Through the student support centers, a variety of support type activities were available to special needs college students who either requested such services or were referred to the centers by the instructional staff. Some of the services available included media-based individualized instructions, educational tutoring, and small group classes for the academically disadvantaged; financial aid and work-study programs for the economically disadvantaged; counseling, mobility aides, interpreters, note takers, reader services, and so forth for the handicapped; English as a Second Language training, bilingual tutors, and curricular materials for the limited English proficient; and peer counseling and employability skill classes for women, particularly displaced homemakers who had a need to enter or reenter the labor market. Although the services were grouped by special populations, they were available to any student at the college who requested or had a need for them.

Two types of separate programs for special needs populations were also identified at the community college level. The first type, academically related and supported primarily with state and local district funds, was the most common. The second type, occupationally oriented and supported with CETA and VEA funds, was identified in a few colleges only.

Separate, academically oriented programs had been established by most community colleges as a strategy to increase the reading, language, and math proficiency of academically disadvantaged students prior to matriculation or entry into the degree granting programs offered by the college. Thus, when students were identified as academically disadvantaged or limited-English proficient at the time of admission, they were placed in remedial or ESL classes either before entry, during an intensive summer program, or after entry, as part of the regular academic year. In general, these courses carried no credit and were mandatory; students had to complete the established sequence successfully or had to demonstrate proficiency prior to matriculation.

In addition, several of the community colleges visited had established, either on campus or in satellite locations, separate skills centers offering CETA-eligible clients occupational training in a variety of areas. In most cases, the clients were referred to the college by other agencies, and the college operated as the CETA subcontractor in the delivery of the vocational training.

In a similar relationship with the Department of Rehabilitation, two colleges had established separate skills training centers for some physically and mentally handicapped students. Unlike the long-term care and sheltered employment services offered by most community-based programs for the handicapped, however, activities at the college centers focused more on the transitional skills and support types of services needed by handicapped individuals to compete successfully in the labor force.

In contrast to the LEAs, the community colleges actively sought to establish ties with external agencies as a strategy for improving occupational services to all students, including those with special needs. In many cases, these interorganizational arrangements had led to a variety of innovative programs for special needs populations using local industries and trade unions as resources for services to the special groups.

3. Community-Based Organizations.

Most community-based organizations that served the training and employment needs of special populations were, in general, of two types: (1) those supported directly by CETA to provide services to economically disadvantaged persons, many of whom were also academically disadvantaged, limited-English proficient, handicapped, or women, and (2) those supported, in part, by the Department of Rehabilitation and, in part, by private sources to provide rehabilitation, training, and employment services to handicapped persons.

With regard to the CETA-supported agencies, there was a high degree of consistency in the strategies used to serve the employment needs of their clients. In most cases, because of the high incidence of academic disadvantagement among their client populations, program administrators were forced to develop comprehensive programs for teaching remedial reading and math skills before providing employment or occupational training services. Often, a substantial portion of their available resources was devoted to these programs, and, as a result, administrators were concerned about their ability to show a high success rate for their training programs.

Private, nonprofit organizations such as the Association for Retarded Citizens and Goodwill Industries, among others, were the principal agencies providing training and employment services to handicapped adults. In general, these agencies provided a combination of survival skills training and some occupational training through client participation in sheltered workshops. Although often the purpose of the programs was to provide rehabilitative services to clients prior to competitive employment, in many cases more than 90 percent of the client population would remain in the sheltered workshops indefinitely. The lack of appropriate transitional services before and during the first few months of employment was a persistent point of criticism among advocates for handicapped populations. Another concern expressed by these advocates was the apparent exclusion of many learning disabled and mentally handicapped persons from training and employment services provided by community-based agencies; in many cases, it appeared as if the mentally retarded population was the prime beneficiary of the services available by most rehabilitative agencies.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES

1. School Districts.

The distribution and, more importantly, the coordination and use of available resources at the LEA level followed the planning activities and strategies adopted to serve the needs of special populations. Thus, in almost all cases, schools targeted VEA resources for special projects and activities for academically disadvantaged and handicapped populations only.

The typical distribution pattern for VEA funds for the disadvantaged allowed each high school in a district to share part of the district's total allocation. Often, however, the funds were inadequate to have an effect on school vocational program planning or development for the disadvantaged populations. Of particular interest was the fact that few, if any, schools or school districts had considered the possibility of coordinating the VEA resources for the disadvantaged with those from other federal (ESEA, Title I and VII) or state categorical programs designed to serve the academic needs of the same students. Several reasons were identified for this apparent lack of coordination and multiple use of funding for the disadvantaged. First, federal and state compensatory programs were typically administered and coordinated by district-based administrators who rarely co-planned programs with vocational educators who, in most cases, controlled the use of the VEA funds. In the absence of local statutory policy direction, each group of administrators pursued its own interests without concern for coordination of funding. Second, in contrast to the flexibility in the administration and use of the VEA funds enjoyed by vocational administrators, federal and state compensatory and other categorical aid programs entailed many burdensome and prohibitive regulations with regard to student eligibility requirements and programming of funds. Moreover, many vocational educators expressed concern that such programs were counterproductive for vocational education students and indeed were harming vocational and career education programs by interfering with students' opportunities to enroll in vocational courses. Finally, in most cases, the VEA resources targeted to the disadvantaged were too small in comparison to other federal and state categorical funds available to provide incentives for program administrators to become involved in in vocational education.

In contrast to the issues and difficulties of coordinating various internal sources of funding for programs for the disadvantaged, the distribution and utilization pattern of VEA funds for the handicapped encouraged multiple uses of school district resources. Although vocational administrators were typically considered the grantees for all VEA funds, in most cases, those targeted to handicapped students were passed through to the central office special educators who, as the implementing group, planned and programmed for their use. The singular advantage of this arrangement was that this group of district administrators was also responsible for administering and programming the federal P.L. 94-142 funds as well as state special education funds for the handicapped. Thus, opportunties for coordinating multiple sources of funding in support of vocational programs for the handicapped were more evident than those for the disadvantaged. Nevertheless, special educators faced different problems related to negative attitudes and priorities among school staff toward equitable educational opportunities for the handicapped. The greatest irony, therefore, was that, despite the availability of financial resources, sometimes the programs for the handicapped lacked the necessary support of high school personnel.

At both the LEA and the community college levels, considerable confusion appeared to exist concerning the meaning of "excess costs" and the requirements for local matching of VEA special needs funds. In general, the interpretation of excess costs focused more on program administration costs rather than individual per pupil costs. That is, excess costs were defined as the additional funds required to cover expenses for occupational programs that cost more than the revenues they generated through students' enrollment and participation. With regard to the needs of matching funds, it appeared that the VEA requirements had not created new local monies for services to special populations. In almost all cases where the requirements were not met at the state level, the educational jurisdictions applied part of their tax-levy allocations earmarked for regular vocational programs as the local matching portion.

2. Community Colleges.

The predominant community college strategy for allocating the VEA categorical funds for special needs populations was to support ongoing student services and instructional programs. Often, occupational deans, working collaboratively with directors of the colleges' student support service centers, agreed to contribute to the operation of the centers or instructional departments by paying for part-time staff or by purchasing appropriate materials to be used for special needs students enrolled in occupational programs. Because, often, these student service centers were funded partly with higher education federal and state grants and partly with local district funds, the VEA contribution represented attempts to coordinate existing resources in an effort to integrate the programs and to provide more complete and comprehensive counseling, remedial education, tutorial, and other support services to the college students who needed them.

In addition to coordination of VEA resources to support supplementary services, a few community colleges also used VEA categorical funds to support separate skills programs for special needs students or to initiate small pilot efforts to serve particular subpopulations of students. The separate efforts were usually related to programs supported either by CETA or by the Department of Rehabilitation. The colleges, in addition to the VEA support, often contributed in-kind services to the operation of the separate programs. Finally, some isolated efforts were identified, particularly in community colleges in Florida and California, where VEA funds had been used to pilot test and support new ideas or curriculum strategies to serve special needs populations.

3. Community-Based Organizations.

For the most part, community-based organizations serving the training and employment needs of special populations operated independently of the education agencies in the communities. Their funding came from a combination of public and private sources, including CETA, the Department of Rehabilitation, philanthropies and, in some cases, particularly for agencies serving the handicapped, contracts with private employers and sales of novelty and decorative products through local or nationwide distribution centers. Seldom did the community-based groups use VEA resources to provide services to their adult clients.

According to administrators of CETA-sponsored employment and training programs, the academic competence of their clients was so low that, in most cases, attention had to be devoted to the acquisition of minimum proficiencies in reading, language, and math skills prior to participation in the training and employment programs. As a result, most of the programs had devised strategies and had allocated program resources to provide remedial instructions to their clients either on-site or through referrals to the local community colleges. The similarity of the argument presented by school representatives with regard to services for academically disadvantaged students was particularly evident: limited basic skills training had to be provided prior to placement in existing regular vocational or job training programs. Researchers could not help but be struck by the existence of an almost "parallel" educational system that was being supported by CETA funds for economically disadvantaged persons for whom the public education system had been of little use.

F. EFFECTS

This study elicited respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of VEA programs for special needs populations, and their opinions in what new programs were needed and how existing efforts could be improved.

1. School Districts.

Based on discussions with respondents, two observations emerged sharply from the analysis of the interview data at the LEA level. One, the VEA appeared to have minimal effects on increasing the participation of special needs populations in regular vocational programs and, two, the effects of the VEA provisions with regard to vocational options for LEP students, economically disadvantaged students, women and Indians were negligible since VEA special needs program activities were rarely targeted to them.

The major recipients of VEA-supported special needs services and activities at the LEA level were the academically disadvantaged students and the handicapped, primarily the mentally retarded students, for whom special or separate vocationally oriented programs had been established and were supported with VEA dollars. In a few instances as well, LEAs used the funds to initiate and pilot-test unique programs such as vocational evaluation centers (Jacksonville, Florida, and Modesto, California) and after-school and shared instruction programs (New York City) designed to increase the vocational opportunities of handicapped and academically disadvantaged students. Thus, to the extent that such options and opportunities had been extended for disadvantaged and handicapped students, as a result of VEA programs, the national expenditures had positive effects on these subgroups.

Many school district representatives expressed concerns that the "back to basics" movement and its related policy emphasis on proficiency requirements usually defined in terms of academic skills rather than work-related skills had a harming effect on career and vocational education opportunities for students, particularly for those with special needs. Additional academic course requirements as well as the need for remedial education for students who failed proficiency exams but wanted to graduate from high school precluded them from participating in vocational training. This was particularly the case when students were required to travel to skill centers for their vocational training and had to devote at least one-half day for such activities.

None of the districts visited had adopted specific policies or identification or planning procedures for services to special needs students that were prompted by the provisions of the national VEA. In most cases, the existing policies and procedures affecting the identification of special needs populations and the scope and nature of the instructional and support services provided to them were established as a result of other federal and state mandates, in particular, the provisions of P.L. 94-142 affecting services to the handicapped and ESEA Title I and state compensatory programs for the academically disadvantaged.

In many cases, however, particularly with regard to ESEA, Title I for the disadvantaged, the criteria for program eligibility and student assessment of needs were more appropriate to academic course requirements than work-related proficiences. As a result, the typical strategies and programs designed to help students overcome handicaps that prevented them from succeeding in regular vocational education were rarely based on specific vocational or work related needs assessments.

The local districts' priorities related to basic proficiency requirements in academic areas and the availability of sizable funds in most school districts for compensatory remedial education programs for academically disadvantaged students resulted in extensive program planning and administration activities for disadvantaged students at the LEA level. Unfortunately, vocational educators were, in general, excluded from this process; therefore, their role in the development of guidelines and procedures for district-wide programs for these students was limited. Thus, in most cases, planning and program activities for the VEA funds for the disadvantaged were carried out independently by each district's vocational education administrators and building principals. Based on these activities, the funds were either distributed among the various schools to be used at the discretion of the principals or allocated to the separate vocationally oriented programs for the purchase of shop equipment and materials to be used by academically disadvantaged students. As a result of these uncoordinated efforts, VEA-related projects for disadvantaged students tended to act in isolation from other school-based programs and, in general, had minimal effects on the target population.

2. Community Colleges.

In contrast to the separate, often uncoordinated efforts typical of many VEA special needs projects at the LEA level, community colleges presented a totally different picture. In most cases, coordinated planning and needs assessment activities led to integrated strategies to serve the needs of all special populations within the context of regular occupational and academic programs. Moreover, the support services and special activities were supported with multiple sources of funding, including federal, state, and local dollars. College administrators seemed much less concerned with the need to "keep the programs separate" and not to co-mingle categorical funds than were their LEA counterparts.

In part because of this apparent flexibility and in part because of the colleges' expressed concern to be responsive to the education and training needs of all persons in their communities, key administrators seemed more willing to take calculated risks and to seek outside expertise and collaborative relationships in an effort to establish programs and services for the special needs populations. Despite these efforts, however, problems existed; in some instances, college administrators noted that, because of the large size of the special needs populations, particularly the academically disadvantaged, their efforts often fell short and some students dropped out before completing training or were guided into less demanding occupations. This appeared to be particularly the case with regard to training for occupations in the allied health field, especially nursing. In fact, several community colleges had established special resource centers to assist academically disadvantaged students and thereby, to increase their representation in this area.

3. Community Based Organizations.

As noted, community-based organizations that were either totally supported by CETA or partly supported by Vocational Rehabilitation planned and conducted their programs for special needs clients independent of vocational programs in the local schools. In many cases, the CETA prime sponsor and the local Department of Rehabilitation seemed to play a positive supportive role, but the responsibilities for program design and implementation rested with the program directors and their staff.

All of the programs, it seemed, were hindered by lack of financial resources because of the fact that a considerable portion of their budgets had to be directed toward the provisions of remedial reading and math skills and in some cases, ESL instruction instead of occupational and employment training. In this regard, some prime sponsors were considering the alternative of consolidating academic training for all CETA-eligible clients in a district under the aegis of one subcontractor rather than having each agency develop and conduct its own programs.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

This study, part of a larger effort by the National Institute of Education to review the change wrought by the Federal vocational education legislation adopted in 1976, examined the goals of that legislation as related to the delivery of vocational education services to populations identified as having "special needs." "Special needs populations" were identified by specific "set-asides" in the vocational education legislation; originally including only the disadvantaged and handicapped, over time they came to include also persons who were limited English-proficient and Indians. Although women were not specifically included among the special needs populations as defined by the set-aside provisions, the sex equity concerns of Congress were expressed through the legislation to reduce sex-bias and stereotyping in vocational education. The set-aside provisions established a base dollar amount each state had to use for programs for students with special needs, and provided incentives to the states to target more of their funds to these special needs categories.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to learn how local communities of different sizes and in different parts of the nation identified special needs populations, planned programs, and coordinated strategies and resources to meet the vocational education needs of these subpopulations. The study attempted to answer the following questions:

- What are the policies of local education agencies and other institutions regarding the delivery of vocational/occupational education to the special needs populations?
- How are the populations defined?
- Who established the definitions of the populations?
- What data are used to identify the various subgroups of the special needs populations?
- What methods are used to place special needs populations in vocational/occupational education classes?
- Who makes this determination?
- Who is involved in planning for the delivery of services to the special needs populations?

- What types of vocational/occupational training are available to the special needs populations?
- What strategies are employed to overcome problems that may inhibit the full participation of those among the special needs populations who wish to participate in vocational/occupational education or programs?
- What resources--federal, state, local, public, and private--are arrayed to support the various programs designed to service the special needs populations?
- What are the effects of participation in the variety of vocational/occupational classes or programs for the special needs populations?

B. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPECIAL NEEDS STUDY AND THE VOCATIONAL STUDY

The special needs study augments the larger Vocational Education Study undertaken by the National Institute of Education (NIE) in that it allows policymakers, researchers, and vocational educators to examine in microcosm the issues of the Study through specific examples. This larger Study is in direct response to the Congressional mandate to undertake "a thorough evaluation and study of vocational education programs, including programs conducted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and other related programs conducted under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 and by the State Post-Secondary Commissions authorized by the Educational Amendments of 1972."

In responding to that mandate, the National Institute of Education commissioned a set of planning papers to elicit a variety of viewpoints on vocational education policy, practices, and problems. A set of issues related to the delivery of vocational education services to the "special needs populations" and the ability of the existing system to meet the needs of those subpopulations was clearly identified. The Institute then developed and submitted a Plan for the Study of Vocational Education to the Congress for approval. When approval was secured, the Plan gave primary emphasis to four major substudy areas: distribution of vocational education funds, compliance with the applicable laws of the United States, means of assessing program quality and effectiveness, and a review and evaluation of the Consumer and Homemaking Education programs.

The Plan also indicated that other inquiries would be undertaken and that an effort would be made to determine changes in the vocational education enterprise attributed to the Education Amendments of 1976. One of these other inquiries focused on the delivery of vocational education services to the "special needs populations." This substudy cut across the inquiries related to the distribution of vocational education funds, compliance, and evaluation practices, and attempted to assess how and to what extent the needs of special groups for occupational education identified in Federal legislation were being met at the local community level.

By focusing on the array of resources used to provide vocational education services to the special needs populations in selected sites, the study provides information relative to the distribution of Federal, state, and local vocational education funds, and other possible resources that might be tapped in a community. The data focusing on policies, identification, definitions and placement of special needs populations inform the Study relative to state and local compliance of Federal guidelines and intent. Finally, by looking at the variety of strategies employed to service the special needs population, the data relate as well to the study on the responsiveness of the Consumer and Homemaking Education System at the state and local levels.

C. THE FOCUS ON SPECIAL NEEDS

In the early 1960s, as part of the Kennedy Administration's concern with improving employment opportunities for the poor, a comprehensive study of vocational education was undertaken, entitled, "Education for a Changing World of Work." The study recommended that there be a new focus on youth who have academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps that prevented them from succeeding in a regular high school vocational program. As a result, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-210) articulated for the first time a policy concerned with special needs populations by emphasizing that vocational education programs should respond more effectively to their needs. Congress did not, however, incorporate any specific mechanism into the legislation to ensure that funds would be targeted directly on this population group.

In 1968, Congress determined that the special policy emphasis in the 1963 legislation had not resulted in services that had met the needs of the disadvantaged populations. Congress, therefore, targeted funds on special needs populations by creating set-aside programs for the disadvantaged and the handicapped. The 1968 Amendments (P.L. 90-576) required that at least 15 percent of each state's basic Part B grant be used for vocational education programs for the disadvantaged. A totally federally funded program for the disadvantaged was also created in Section 102(b) of the Act to design and implement projects for this population. With regard to the handicapped, ten percent of the same basic grant had to be used to serve "persons who because of their handicapping condition cannot succeed in the regular vocational education programs without special education assistance or who require a modified vocational education program."

Between 1968 and 1976, the only programmatic shift in the vocational education legislation involved the passage of Part J of the Vocational Education Act, recognizing the need for bilingual vocational training. Passed as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1974, this program focused on meeting the programmatic, curricula, and personnel training needs of individuals whose efforts to profit from vocational education were severely restricted by their limited English-speaking ability. If they were to succeed in vocational training, these students needed the opportunity to learn in a bilingual environment.

In the Vocational Education Act of 1976, Congress added two new special needs groups, women and Indians. In sections 101 and 104 of the act, legislators recognized the problem of sex bias, sex stereotyping, and sex discrimination in vocational education programs. Congress, therefore, mandated the Office of Education to develop and carry out such programs of vocational education within each state so as to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs and, thereby, furnish equal educational opportunities in vocational education to persons of both sexes. While no set-aside was established to help achieve this objective, funds were appropriated to ensure that each state hired full-time personnel to perform various research, evaluation, and program development functions that would assist the state in achieving this purpose.

In Section 103, Congress created a special set-aside for Indian tribal governments or tribal organizations, which for the first time mandated that tribes receive a specified portion of Vocational Education Act funds directly from the federal government. The need for such a program was suggested in a report concerning vocational education legislation. The report had noted that vocational education administrators did not feel a responsibility for Indians, since the Bureau of Indian Affairs had been created for that purpose.

A number of references in the legislation, to either specific groups or types of needs, have served to direct differing levels of attention to specific groups or subgroups. For example, displaced homemakers have received emphasis, although there is no specific reference to that term in the legislation. There are, however, direct references to the types of needs displaced homemakers have.

The needs of persons in correctional institutions are recognized by virtue of the requirement that there be a representative of state correctional institutions on the State Advisory Council and inclusion of a focus on youthful offenders and adults in correctional institutions under the vocational guidance and counseling program. Early retirees are similarly referenced under the vocational guidance and counseling section.

In addition to defining the major new special needs groups, P.L. 94-482 emphasized Congress' concern with the needs of previously identified special population groups. In response to data about how the existing set-asides were working and the continuing need of these groups, Congress significantly strengthened the specific special needs provisions in the 1976 Act in a manner that had clear implications for local service delivery strategies.

First, Congress reauthorized set-asides for the disadvantaged and handicapped, underscoring the need for services to the disadvantaged by increasing the set-aside from 15 to 20 percent. Within the framework of the disadvantaged provisions, Congress also made explicit its intent that persons who are limited-English proficient receive a fair share of the set-aside by incorporating a formula to determine the amount of funds to be targeted on this group.

Second, there was the requirement that states directly match the funds available under each of the set-aside provisions. According to the 1968 Amendments, states were required to match the total pool of the funds available to them under the basic grant program and to spend the set-aside funds on services for the special needs populations. The direct matching requirement in the 1976 legislation was included to ensure a stronger commitment to the special needs groups. The 1976 legislation also required that the set-aside funds be used at the local level to pay for the excess costs incurred because of the students' special needs. Thus, in effect, the combination of the matching requirements and excess cost provisions stipulated that the federal set-aside funds could only be used to pay up to 50 percent of the additional costs related to provision of special vocational education services and activities for special needs students.

Third, the Congress made clear its intent that all efforts should be made by state and local officials to ensure that special needs populations were given every opportunity to participate in regular vocational education programs. While the term "mainstreaming" was not mentioned in the legislation, the effect of Section 110(d) is to "mainstream" the disadvantaged and handicapped populations. Congress required that state vocational education be consistent with plans under P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, which mandates placement of handicapped persons in "the least restrictive environment."

The significance of these changes is highlighted by the fact that one-third of disadvantaged students were not participating in regular classes in 1976, according to a major study by the Olympus Research Corporation.* In the case of the handicapped, a related study by the same organization indicated that:

> ...approximately two-thirds of the local administrators said...it was their policy to integrate the handicapped with regular students. However, in most areas where the policy called for integration, implementation was still far from a reality. Of the students enrolled in the program, 70 percent were in "special classes".... There were several reasons for lack of implementation: (1) reluctance of instructors to accept handicapped students, (2) inability of instructors to teach the handicapped, (3) lack of individualized instruction techniques in most projects, and (4) referral of individuals who could not succeed in advanced skills training classes.**

In short, the principle of ensuring equal access to vocational education for special needs populations emerged as a priority of Congress in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, and, thus, was an essential issue for consideration by the NIE Vocational Education Study.

---

* Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged Under Part B and Part A, Section 102(b) of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act, December 1976.

** Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped Under Part B of the 1966 Amendment to the Vocational Education Act, October 1974.

D. ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

This report is organized to report the findings of the study as those findings relate to vocational education services delivery to special needs populations and to suggest changes that could enhance the ability of the vocational education legislation to provide equality of access to vocational and occupational education for special needs populations. Subsequent chapters are arranged as follows. First, the methods and procedures that guided the research effort are presented: the development of the interview instrument, site selection, identification of respondent types, nature of the data collection process, analysis of the data, and preparation of the report. Then, the findings are presented. The first set, Chapters Three through Eight, relate to each subgroup of the special needs populations: the academically disadvantaged, the economically disadvantaged, the handicapped, the limited English-proficient, women, and Indians. Findings for each of these subgroups are presented according to the major issues covered in the interviews of respondents and in the reviews of all documents and literature: policy, definition, identification, and placement of the special needs populations; planning activities for special needs populations; strategies employed to deliver vocational and support services; resources; and the effects of participation in special needs projects. Within each, information is presented as it relates to three major categories of institutions and agencies that provided vocational/occupational education services: local education agencies (LEAs), community college districts, and community institutions including the CETA sponsor and the Department of Rehabilitation.

The second set of findings (appended to the report) relates to linkages and cooperative relationships among organizations and agencies that provided vocational/occupational education services. The findings address the nature of such arrangements, the participants in the arrangements, the purposes of the arrangements/consortia, the nature of the services exchanged, and the environmental contexts in which these arrangements were made. Where possible, some models for providing vocational/occupational services to the special needs populations as a whole or to subgroups within the population are identified.

Finally, the summary and conclusions of the research effort are given and recommendations are made in Chapter Nine. These recommendations are intended to enhance the opportunity for access to vocational/ occupational programs for the special needs populations.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. WHY THE CASE STUDY METHODOLOGY

The issue of vocational education options and opportunities available to special needs populations in local communities has been the focus of considerable attention beginning with the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Recent nationwide surveys have attempted to explore the various local policies, decisions, and strategies impacting on the quality and effectiveness of vocational education for special needs populations.

Although the results of survey studies can point to national trends and identify problems or inconsistencies among policies, programs, and outcomes for special needs populations, they do not provide very much depth on any one issue. Details describing the methods for identifying special needs populations, the planning process, and the strategies and resources used to provide services and their consequences are given on only a few lines in most survey forms; hence, they often do not provide satisfactory answers to many of the questions legislators and policymakers are likely to raise about particular issues.

Some of these problems can be satisfied by taking a more qualitative, case study approach to determine how and to what extent the vocational needs of special needs populations identified in P.L. 94-482 are being met at the local community level. Although it is difficult to tell whether case study findings describe unique situations or are representative of patterns that apply generally to many settings, they enable the researchers to understand the nature of existing local conditions affecting the strategies used to serve special needs populations and to discover the host of factors that may contribute to or limit the effectiveness of the services provided. Thus, intensive interviewing in a small number of communities was decided as the most appropriate research method for achieving the objectives of the study--that is, to develop a narrative, supported by specific examples based on observations and interviews with respondents from different communities, describing the ways in which the provisions of the VEA were interpreted by persons responsible for vocational education services to special needs populations and affected the strategies used to provide the special services to them within the context of the public schools, the community colleges, and the community-based training and employment agencies.

While the case study methodology is particularly useful for informing policymakers about the range of mechanisms and the variety of ways a particular legislation may affect individuals and organizations at the local level, it is limited since the number of sites participating is generally too small to be representative. For most case studies, a major consideration then is the selection of a sample small enough to be manageable, but large enough to reveal a range of interesting variations and patterns of behaviors related to the study questions. In the present case, 15 sites were selected for study in an effort to identify the ways in which local communities attempted to meet the vocational education needs of special groups. Clearly, a sound national vocational education policy concerning special needs populations must be informed by an understanding of the situational conditions existing at the local level and the perceptions and behaviors of local policymakers, administrators, and teachers.

B. SITE SELECTION

Interview data for this special needs study were collected from five states: California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. Two factors influenced this selection. First, these were the core states included in the research design of other studies conducted for the NIE as part of its comprehensive Vocational Education Study. Thus, accurate data concerning state vocational education policies and practices were available to the research team without imposing a burden on other states. Second, the special needs data collected at the local level in these states could be of greater value to the NIE since they could be integrated with results obtained from the other studies, in particular, the efforts focusing on special needs populations at the state level and the study of the distribution patterns of vocational education funds.

Because the special needs study was designed to yield information from a community perspective, an important issue was whether the strategies used to provide vocational education services to the special populations and, thus, the options and opportunities available to these groups varied as a function of community size and population density. Therefore, the decision was made early in the design stage of the study to include in the sample of sites from each of the five states a large metropolitan area, a mid-size community, and a rural community.

Fifteen communities were selected for study. Census Bureau criteria and definitions were used to classify the various communities in each of the five states. Actual selection of sites was made after consideration of the following demographic characteristics for each possible site: number of low-income families, rate of adult and youth unemployment, and concentration of minority populations. Another condition governing selection was the concern to reduce the burden on local representatives. Thus, as much as possible, researchers attempted to select sites not under consideration by the other NIE Vocational Education Study teams of investigators. Selection of the final sample depended also on the team's ability to obtain the consent of key administrators at the public LEA in each community selected to participate in the study. In this respect, only two of the original sample of 15 were unwilling to participate because of time constraints and other scheduling difficulties.

Selection of the 15 participating sites in no way could be considered a representative sample in a strict sense. In fact, representativeness was not a criterion used since none of the data would be aggregated quantitatively. Despite the selection constraints, the team felt that the sample would be typical, more or less, of the major types of vocational strategies and programs offered in communities of various size. The 15 communities making up the sample are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
COMMUNITIES SELECTED FOR STUDY

STATE	METROPOLITAN CITIES	MID-SIZE COMMUNITIES	RURAL COMMUNITIES
California	Oakland	Modesto	Holtville
Florida	Jacksonville	Fort Pierce	Monticello
Illinois	Chicago	Quincy	Rosiclaire
New York	New York City	Poughkeepsie	Norwich
Texas	San Antonio	Texarkana	Aspermont

C. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

In each community the team attempted as much as possible to obtain documents and written descriptions of vocational education activities related to special needs populations. However, the primary approach to data collection relied heavily on interviews. Interviews were conducted with a variety of respondents--most were centrally identified with the planning, administration, and implementation of vocational education programs for the special populations. The interviews, which were scheduled in advance, consisted of open-ended questions designed to elicit responses to the critical issues identified initially by the NIE Vocational Education Study with the advice of vocational educators, as well as representatives of special needs populations.

The instruments went through several phases of development and refinement before they were submitted to the Office of the Federal Education Data Acquisition Council (FEDAC) for clearance. The interview guides were pilot-tested by using school administrators and guidance counselors in Baltimore, Maryland, as respondents. The interviews were supplemented with extensive discussion of the instrument and the procedures used. The results indicated the feasibility and appropriateness of the questions but suggested as well the need for minor revisions and simplification. The major change effected as a result of the pilot-test was that the interviewers were given considerable latitude for on-the-spot judgments of questions to pursue with respondents in order to get the "picture" for each of the major issues/categories indicated in the instrument.

D. SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

Because emphasis was placed on obtaining a complete picture of how a community responded to the vocational/occupational needs of special needs populations, the population of respondents for the study was classified into three broad categories: (1) those at the secondary school level in public LEAs and in vocational/skills centers, (2) those at the post-secondary level, primarily community colleges, and (3) those in the community at large, including representatives of private, nonprofit community-based organizations (CBOs), public training and employment agencies, vocational advisory councils, and employers.

At the level of the LEA, key respondents were further categorized as (1) policymakers, including board members, superintendents, and key deputies; (2) administrative decision-makers: directors and supervisors of vocational education, special education, bilingual education, state and federal compensatory programs, research/planning and curriculum, guidance/counseling and employment, CETA youth programs, and sex equity; and (3) school and instructional personnel: principals, assistant principals, counselors, teachers, and teacher aides. In some schools, when investigators were able to meet with them, students and parents were interviewed as well.

It should be noted that the position titles varied considerably among LEAs. Furthermore, particularly in rural schools, a single person often performed a number of functions and, thus, was categorized both as an administrator and a teacher or counselor. In general, however, the most comprehensive interviews were conducted with administrative types of respondents who were able and willing to set aside one hour or more of their time to describe strategies and procedures for serving the needs of special needs populations. Interviews with policymakers and, especially, with instructional personnel in the school were often limited to 15 minutes or less.

For post-secondary institutions, at least one community college serving each of the 15 sites was visited by the researchers. The same respondent types as those listed above for the LEAs were interviewed. In some instances, because of time and scheduling constraints, group rather than individual interviews had to be conducted. Based on the information obtained, however, investigators could identify and request individual meetings with persons present or absent from the group discussion. When the schedules permitted, not once was a specific request denied.

The types and number of community-based respondents varied depending on the size and characteristics of the community. In each community, researchers scheduled interviews minimally with the following respondents: a representative of the local advisory council for vocational education (often an employer in the community), a representative of the CETA prime sponsor (city, county, or balance-of-state), and a representative of the local Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The number of representatives of CBOs interviewed, including those providing educational and occupational services to special needs populations through financial arrangements with CETA or

Departments of Rehabilitation and those acting as advocates for special populations, varied considerably from site to site. In some rural communities, neither of these types of representatives could be readily identified.

E. PROCEDURES FOR SITE VISITS

Recognizing the need for advance preparation due to (1) the complexity of the issues involved concerning each special needs population, (2) the relatively large number of sites to be visited as well as the heterogeneity of the sites, and (3) the broad range of respondents to be interviewed, the research team, with the support of the NIE staff, took several preparatory measures before actual field work. The first measure consisted of an intensive training program involving a series of information-sharing meetings with representatives from the Department of Education, Department of Labor, public interest groups, as well as researchers in the field of vocational education. Information gathered through these meetings was used to redefine issues of importance with respect to the special needs groups, to highlight the concerns and needs for information by the various federal agencies and to solidify a frame of reference for gathering the essential data.

An important second step prior to field work involved the preparation of a briefing paper for each of the 15 communities in the sample. Often, the papers consisted of no more than a series of statistics, based on existing documents and analyses depicting the essential characteristics of each community including the LEA and the community colleges serving that area. Although already available documents were requested in advance from each LEA to enrich the briefing papers and to diminish the burden in the field, few were forwarded. It may well be that the approximately two-week turnaround time allowed was too short for the LEAs to respond. Nevertheless, the site briefing papers proved to be essential as baseline data for developing and structuring the field work efforts.

The field work was conducted during April, May, and June 1980 by two two-person teams of researchers, including the principal investigator. Before the actual visits, contact was made with most potential respondents in the communities. Both at the LEAs and the community colleges, the directors or deans of vocational/technical educaton were asked to identify key individuals to be interviewed and to schedule tentative appointments. For the community-based respondents, the investigators assumed responsibility for making contact directly. Letters of introduction explaining the purpose of the study were forwarded to most respondents before the site visit.

Data for each site were collected according to the following time schedule: five-day site visits for the metropolitan cities, three days for the mid-size communities, and two days for the rural areas. Thus, each team of investigators, operating separately, was responsible for all field work in a given state during a continuous period of two weeks. A two-week debriefing period in Washington, D.C., followed before any further site activity.

Team members interviewed respondents either jointly or separately depending on the scheduling of interviews. In general, the initial organizational meeting with the LEA representative in the community and the exit interview were attended by both members of the team. In most cases, it was possible to identify key respondents in advance of the site visit. However, the investigators often made on-site judgments of who to see and what issues to pursue to get a complete and coherent narrative of what happened at the local level. Thus, they acted partly as researchers and partly as investigative reporters.

F. DATA ANALYSIS

Primary data for this study were the interviews conducted at the 15 sites, although documents and other descriptive materials were also obtained whenever they were made available on-site to the researchers. These latter sources were used primarily to support or clarify various points emerging from the qualitative analysis of the data. Observations were another source of information and, although unsystematic, provided insight into the overall process of how actors, actions, and events fitted together.

For each interview, a standard protocol was used to record the information obtained according to the following six major issues of interest:

- local policies concerning vocational education for special needs populations,
- definitions and methods of identification,
- planning,
- strategies used to meet the needs of special populations,
- use of resources to provide services, and
- effects of such services on special needs populations.

Each protocol was coded immediately before the interview according
to the following categories: (1) state, (2) type of community (e.g., city, 8v
mid-size community, rural), (3) respondent type (e.g., secondary, post-
secondary, community-based), (4) nature of responsibilities (e.g., policy,
administrative, instructional), and (5) identification with special needs
population (e.g., disadvantaged, handicapped, LEP, women and Indians).

After each day's round of interviews, team members conducted debriefing sessions to review the information obtained and to determine new lines of investigations to be explored. As soon as possible after each interview, all field notes were transcribed on 5 x 8 data cards, each identified by the appropriate respondent code.

This organization of field notes allowed the researchers maximum flexibility in the analysis of the data since the cards could be arranged and rearranged along the major variables under consideration. Thus, emergent relationships and patterns of behaviors could be identified and propositions tested by reordering the cards according to major issues, site characteristics, or respondent characteristics. This procedure, which allowed for qualitative aggregation and analysis, was particularly useful in comparing specific aspects across sites. A major limitation, inherent in all qualitative analyses of data, however, was that information could only be examined one dimension at a time. Nevertheless, the procedure is well recognized as providing researchers maximum flexibility in the cross validation of data and interpretation of results. It should be noted, however, that no attempt was made to quantify the data along any of the study variables. Since the sample selected for study was nonrepresentative, and moreover, since considerable variability among sites was anticipated, the focus of the analysis was the individual sites. That is, the research team attempted to examine, in each isolated case, how the various factors combined to lead to specific strategies for serving the needs of special populations. The major attempts to analyze the data across sites consisted primarily of abstracting from each case the key circumstances that appeared to produce similar or disimilar effects.

G. PREPARATION AND REPORT

As a preliminary step to this report, 15 site profiles were prepared Final responsibilities for writing the site profiles rested with the two team leaders. Usually, the second person on each team provided editorial critique of initial drafts and, where necessary, helped to fill in gaps. In some cases, follow-up telephone calls were made to respondents to clarify specific issues.

The site profiles were prepared in accordance with a standardized outline, although investigators in each team provided their own analysis of the events observed. The format that was followed for each profile highlighted the focal issues covered in the interview of respondents. For each issue, then, the findings were presented in relation to the special needs populations, the kinds of organizations providing services, and the types of communities visited.

In preparing this report, the team drew principally on the descriptive, narrative portion of each profile, summarizing and highlighting the major points emerging from the qualitative analyses. Recognizing the difficulty of drawing general conclusions from analysis of qualitative information, the team attempted, where possible, in presenting the results to point out the typical situations existing at the local level as well as the unique.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

A. LOCAL POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED PERSONS.

1. Public Education Policy Was Primarily Concerned with the Provision of "Basic Skills" Competency.

When respondents in local education agencies were asked: "What is the policy of the local school board regarding the provision of vocational education services to the academically disadvantaged population of students?", the replies in every case were the same: the primary concern of the local school board is to insure that all students have an "equal educational opportunity." Most definitions of equal educational opportunities were related to respondents' perceptions of what should be the goals of public schools with regard to the education of students. More specifically, respondents perceived that the society expected the public education system to fulfill the major role of preparing all students with competency in the basic skill areas of reading, writing, and computation. Respondents also stated that they felt that this role was appropriate and that human and other resources in the local education agency should be harnessed to insure that the public schools achieved this end.

2. There Was an Absence of Explicit Policy Regarding Vocational Education at the Local Level.

In no case could researchers identify policy statements regarding the provision of vocational education services to students, in general, and academically disadvantaged students, in particular. Instead, researchers found that local education administrators and policymakers felt that there was no need for an explicit statement of policy when local education practices supported vocational education programs.

Many respondents indicated that, by subscribing to the state and federal legislation regarding vocational education and by implementing vocational education programs according to state and federal mandates, there did exist, in fact, a policy of support, even though it was implicit. On the other hand, when questioned about the existence of policy regarding the academically disadvantaged, respondents could and did usually identify policy statements that addressed the local school board's decision to insure that all students, especially the disadvantaged, had "equal access" to all educational programs in the school district.

3. Local Policy Was Directed by State and Federal Legislation Mandates.

In every instance, researchers identified that local school practice regarding the provision of vocational education services to the academically disadvantaged was directed by the requirements of state and federal legislation. The development of state and local standards of academic performance and the provision of "competency" testing in the basic skill areas of reading, mathematics, and writing had a direct effect on all local education agencies. Additionally, the requirements for the receipt of ESEA, Title I, funding directed the activity of the local education agency regarding the provision of services to the academically disadvantaged. Since the academically disadvantaged population was most obvious and sizable in the urban centers, where policy existed regarding services to the academically disadvantaged, it always addressed the issue of the provision of basic skills to that population.

4. Policy Formulation Regarding Services to the Academically Disadvantaged Occurred at the Highest Levels of Administration and Policy in Local School Districts.

Because public education was concerned about its image within society and its ability to account for its mission, policy formulation regarding services to the academically disadvantaged occurred at the highest levels of administration and policymaking in local school districts. In every school district visited by researchers, local school boards had made explicit their expectation that the local school system should first address the provision of basic skills competency for as many children as possible.

Implementation of that policy, therefore, resided at the highest level of school district administration. In small and rural districts, this was most often the primary responsibility of the district superintendent. In large urban areas, this responsibility resided most often in the role of the assistant or associate superintendent for instructional services or curriculum development. Development of programs related to the provision of basic skills education was usually the responsibility of curriculum staffs, which tended to include directors of the academic disciplines, as well as directors or coordinators of the categorical aid programs that provided services to the academically disadvantaged.

5. As a Rule, Vocational Educators Were Not Involved in Policy Formulation/Implementation Regarding Services to the Academically Disadvantaged.

Vocational education was viewed as an elective which some students could choose. It seldom served the majority of students in the local school district. Basic skills acquisition, on the other hand, was viewed by school district administrators and policymakers as essential to the intellectual and personal development of all students. Hence, the elevation of the dialogue about the provision of basic skills competencies to all students in the school district to the policy levels often failed to encompass attention to the manner in which vocational education might contribute to that goal. The result, in almost every case, was that vocational educators were not directly involved in any discussions regarding the provision of basic skills education, in general, or within vocational education settings, in particular, in the school districts.

While the 1976 federal legislation regarding vocational education made clear that services should be provided to those "persons who have handicaps that require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs," when school district officials and policymakers discussed programs that could service those persons who had handicaps, seldom were vocational educators involved in the dialogue, and seldom were vocational education programs viewed as the appropriate vehicle for the delivery of services to those needing assistance, such as the academically disadvantaged.

One of the few exceptions researchers found was in New York City where some attempts at the policy level were made to revitalize certain academic high schools by offering specialized vocational education programs. The objective was to attract higher achieving students to those schools and to counter the existing pattern of high absenteeism, high dropout rates, and vandalism. In an effort to insure the success of these pilot efforts, the school chancellor in New York City directed the key administrators within the Division of High Schools to coordinate and integrate their planning, management, and administrative efforts with those of the Center for Career and Occupational Education (CCOE).

The recent organizational shift of CCOE to Division status in the New York City school system was an indication of the importance policymakers in this LEA placed on vocational education as a strategy for reversing the decaying conditions existing in many of the city's comprehensive high schools. Respondents, especially those at the CCOE, anticipated that the organizational changes would result in greater integration of occupational and academic high school programs as well as coordination of the resources, tax-levy and reimbursable, that were needed to support the new programs.

6. An Outcome of Local Education Policy Regarding the Provision of Services to the Academically Disadvantaged Was the Isolation of Vocational Education from the Mainstream of Education Services Provision.

In many cases, the absence of the involvement of vocational educators in dialogue about the provision of services to the academically disadvantaged and other disadvantaged populations had resulted in the isolation of vocational education from the mainstream of education services provisions. This condition of isolation had resulted in vocational education becoming reactive to, rather than active in, the development of the total educational services to the academically disadvantaged. Two sets of operations had developed at the school district level regarding the provision of educational services to the academically disadvanted. The first was that program administrators for instructional services for the academically disadvantaged tended to place these students in remedial courses, designed to upgrade their proficiency in the basic skills areas. This often meant that academically disadvantaged students who wanted to participate in vocational education programs had limited opportunity to do so. Vocational educators, therefore, often had very few academically disadvantaged students in their classes and were reduced to "counting heads" in order to demonstrate that the provisions of the state and federal legislation were being met.

The other set of operations involved instructional services staff who often assumed that vocational education was the most viable vehicle for servicing the academically disadvantaged who were not meeting success in academic disciplines. Therefore, these students were placed in vocational classes, irrespective of their wishes. As a result, vocational education was often viewed by the students, their parents, and the community at large as a "dumping ground" for the poor, minorities, and other disadvantaged populations. In this instance, vocational education became stigmatized.

The failure of the instructional staff in areas other than vocational education to understand the variety of offerings within vocational education resulted in the indiscriminate placement of academically disadvantaged students in programs for which they were not prepared and in which they experienced more failure. Such placement often resulted in the opposite desired effect. Vocational educators tended to be proprietary and jealous of their reputation to prepare students for immediate entry into employment after graduation. Sometimes, separate programs for the academically disadvantaged were developed, but often these programs did not prepare students sufficiently to meet licensing and certification requirements of the state nor the entry-level requirements for union apprenticeship or post-secondary training programs.

7. At the Community College Level, the Policy Was That of Service to the Entire Community.

Officials of every community college district involved in the interviews reported that the policy of the district was to provide service to all members of the community who came to them. Officials noted that in most instances the percentage of students enrolled in occupational programs was higher than those in the general or liberal arts programs. Additionally, most stated that the percentage of academically disadvantaged students was high and increased with each entering class. Hence, the proportion of academically disadvantaged students enrolled in occupational programs was correspondingly high.

The response of the community college districts had generally been to accept all students who applied as long as they met the stated entrance requirements. They provided, however, a wide array of remedial services which helped to remediate the students' basic skills deficiencies and also to insure their maintenance and successful completion in the programs of their choice. To this end, however, policy formulation and program planning and operation were seen as a collegial effort, requiring the involvement of all segments of the college: admissions, supportive and remedial services (usually called Educational Development), and the various occupational and general program departments.

8. As a Rule Advocates for the Disadvantaged Were Not Involved in the Formulation of Vocational Education Policy at the School District Level.

The federal vocational education legislation required that there be established a local advisory council on vocational education to advise vocational educators regarding appropriate policy, planning, and program strategies. Council members should include representatives from a variety of interests in the community: employers, labor unions, post-secondary training, and advocates for the special needs populations and educational institutions. When researchers could identify advisory groups whose memberships were involved in vocational education policy and planning, those groups seldom contained representation from community-based groups and organizations.

However, when researchers could identify the involvement of community-based groups and organizations in the formulation of school district policy, planning, and program strategies, most often they were represented on committees related to instructional services and desegregation procedures. Thus, community groups appeared to be isolated from vocational educators in their deliberations of services provisions to students.

Although advocates for special needs groups rarely participated in local advisory councils for vocational education, the interests of business, labor, and industry were well represented. The involvement of business and labor was on two levels: the general advisory councils and the trade committees. The former provided overall direction and focus to the vocational programs while the latter focused on the specific occupational curricula, materials, equipment as well as instructional strategies used. Often, these committees and their representatives provided the link between the schools and industry which was critical to the success of the vocational work-experience programs.

9. In Attempting to Serve Its Economically Disadvantaged Clients CETA and Community-Based Organizations Devoted a Major Part of Their Efforts to Providing Remedial Reading and Math Services.

Though the concern of federal and state labor legislation and of many community-based organizations, as stated in their policies, was that of providing employment and training and related education for employment, researchers found that CETA-sponsored programs and community-based programs in the nonprofit arena were devoting at least one-half of their program operations to services designed to remediate academic disadvantagement. Because of this preponderance of effort, time, and money to the remediation of academic deficiencies, many prime sponsors of the comprehensive employment and training programs were redesigning the basic skills assessment procedures and basic skills training programs to insure comparability of quality in training and access to training across programs. In at least one instance identified by researchers, the prime sponsor had centralized all basic skills training under one subcontract and was developing competency-based programs in basic skills akin to the competency-based programs at the local education agency level.

B. DEFINITIONS, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. At the LEA Level, Definition of the Academically Disadvantaged Was Based on State and Federal Legislation.

In every instance, local education agencies defined the academically disadvantaged population according to state and federal legislation. In the case of federal legislation, the definition contained in ESEA, Title I often determined the definition/identification process. Additionally, many states had instituted basic skill proficiency examinations, and, therefore, the definition of the academically disadvantaged population had been expanded to include those who performed poorly on these as well.

Essentially, therefore, the "academically disadvantaged" were defined as any or all of the following:

- Those who were found eligible for ESEA Title I and/or state compensatory programs.
- Those who failed to achieve a certain level of academic proficiency on standardized measures in the areas of reading and computation.
- Those who failed to achieve a certain level of performance on the state competency examination in reading, computation, and writing.

2. There Was an Overlapping of Categories of Disadvantagement Included in the Definition of the "Academically Disadvantaged" at the Local Level.

Researchers found that the criteria applied to the identification process for academic disadvantgement went, at times, beyond the definitions contained in federal and state guidelines. A review of the first and fifth year plans for the vocational education programs in some of the sites revealed that, while the definition of the disadvantaged cross-referenced federal and state legislation, the identification process included other criteria. Most often, the popluation was generally identified as "disadvantaged," rather than specified by the type of the disadvantagement: e.g., academically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, limited-English proficient, and so forth.

In a few cases, under the rubric of "disadvantagement," subcategories included race, economic status, learning performance, attendance patterns, age, and social behavior. Often, the failure of local education agency personnel to disaggregate the various categories of "disadvantagement" resulted in placement of students in special programs, without consideration to their individual needs.

Particularly in urban settings, researchers found that these overlapping categories resulted in disproportionately large numbers of students being identified as "disadvantaged." It was not unusual for respondents in urban areas to state that most of their population was "disadvantaged" and, therefore, the operation of their programs had to be judged with that population and those conditions attendant to them in mind.

On the other hand, respondents in rural and small towns were offended by the need to segregate students according to varying definitions required by state and federal legislation. In almost every instance, administrators, policymakers, and school personnel in small towns and rural areas stated that they resented the need to "label" students for accountability purposes. Most felt that the labeling process limited their ability to perform their jobs and contributed to the development of stereotyping behavior on the part of some personnel. As one teacher stated:

> We are a small town. We know everyone and we know what everyone can do. Some people are smarter than others. No one had to tell you that; it is obvious. But we believe in helping each other. The strong help the weak. That's what we try to teach our kids. We resent having to set up special programs for students. It doesn't help us in social relationships. What we want to do is give individual help to those who need it.

3. Placement Procedures for the Academically Disadvantaged Rarely Considered Factors that might be Potentially Relevant for Success in Vocational Education Other Than Achievement.

The 1976 vocational education legislation specified that the disadvantaged were those "persons (other than handicapped) who had academic or economic handicaps and who required special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs." Rarely were researchers able to identify placement procedures for the "academically" disadvantaged in vocational education classes which were defined in terms of work-related and basic employment skills rather than strictly academic skills. Since identification of the population was based on performance on measures of academic achievement and teacher referrals, placement was made by school personnel, usually a guidance counselor or teacher, as a result of the review of these data. Vocational educators were seldom involved in the student identification process, which in most cases occurred before vocational education placement and which was done district-wide for purposes other than such placement.

The key to understanding the identification and placement procedures of academically disadvantaged students in vocational education programs is to reconstruct the typical sequence of events leading to their placement in such programs. The similarities across sites were particularly striking suggesting the following four-step sequence:

- As a rule, all students in a school district were tested in the areas of reading and math using standardized norm-referenced or criterion-referenced tests as part of the district's ongoing testing and assessment programs and, in some cases, proficiency requirements.

- In most cases, the individual students' scores were used by grade advisors and guidance counselors as a basis for placement in remedial and compensatory programs usually supported with federal ESEA Title I funds and/or state funds for compensatory programs.

- Thus, students were identified in the high schools as academically disadvantaged before placement into vocational education programs was in question. More importantly, however, disadvantagement was usually defined in terms of academic proficiency requirements for successful completion of the academic college preparatory programs rather than proficiency requirements for successful completion of the work-related vocational programs. Rarely did researchers find a situation where a student was identified as academically disadvantaged as a result of vocationally related needs assessment and then provided appropriate support services after being placed in the regular vocational programs.

- Once the identification process was completed, ultimate placement in vocational education programs depended on three factors: academic achievement as demonstrated on standardized tests, availability of "slots" in the vocational programs/courses as determined by the students' demand for enrollment in such courses, and the nature of the vocational programs offered by the district as determined by local school board policies.

Following are some of the observations which suggested this overall sequence.

Three general types of vocational education programs were identified: regular programs, regular programs with opportunities for remedial academic services to academically disadvantaged students, and special or separate vocational/alternative education programs. The first two were the most common. The third type was found most often in the larger LEAs in metropolitan communmities.

Regular Programs. Students who were placed in regular vocational education programs were those who had demonstrated that they met the minimum level of competencies in reading, writing, and math. Also, they had indicated the desire to participate in vocational education programs, usually during or by the end of the ninth or tenth grade, and there were sufficient numbers of slots available for their participation. In some instances, especially when the number of applications for admission exceeded the number of available slots, students might have to be interviewed by the receiving teacher, who made the final decision on who was accepted into the program. When decisions hinged on teacher approval, researchers noted that the tendency of the receiving teacher was to look at both academic capability and social behavior, so as to increase the number of "good, smart kids" who were enrolled in the program. Almost by definition, therefore, very few academically disadvantaged students participated in these programs, which usually had state requirements for numbers of classroom hours, nature of course content, and nature of job training required in order to receive certification or to qualify for post-secondary vocational education programs and other specialized vocational employment programs, such as apprenticeships.

To summarize, for regular vocational programs, administration and instruction were directly done by vocational educators, and placement in the program was often contingent on approval of departmental instructional staff. Hence, of all vocational programs, vocational educators had the most control over placement of students in these programs.

Regular Programs With Supplemental Services. The second general type of vocational programs identified could be described as the regular programs but with opportunities for supplemental services to the academically disadvantaged. Those participating in these programs tended to be less academically gifted students who might fail in the college preparatory programs and who elected to participate in vocational education programs instead. Most often these students were just below the national norm with regard to academic achievement, but exhibited no behavior problems. Their applications were screened by guidance personnel, and, depending on the number of slots available in the regular vocational education programs, they would be tentatively assigned to the program of their choice. In most cases, the receiving teacher had to give final approval. Once in the program, they would be provided with supplementary services, usually remedial classes for one period a day, provided typically in small groups with other academically disadvantaged students, some of whom were not in vocational programs. The instructor would usually be a member of the English or math department, paid, however, with federal or state compensatory funds. In a few cases, the compensatory education teachers coordinated the remedial programs with the students' regular school programs. More often, however, the remedial instructions were unrelated to the students' other course of studies. The supplemental services provided, therefore, were seldom vocationally oriented; they were intended to upgrade the basic skills proficiency of the students so as to insure their ability to cope with the cognitive aspect of the program and to help them pass the proficiency requirements. Rarely did researchers find a "supplemental" set of offerings that focused specifically on the language and math skills necessary and related to success in the students' vocational programs. The only exception was in Duval County, Florida, where students had access to the Individualized Manpower Training System Center where remedial instruction could be tailored to the academic and vocational needs of the students.

Separate Alternative Programs. The third set of vocational programs were those often supported with VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged. These types of "alternative" vocationally oriented programs differed significantly from the first two. Often, students placed in these programs were "counseled" to participate, rather than placed as a result of choice. The placement was generally done by the guidance counselor, who had reviewed the academically disadvantaged students' records and had concluded that this type of student would probably experience failure both in the regular vocational programs and in the regular academic and general programs.

These alternative programs were offered in separate classes or shops in the comprehensive high schools or, more often, in completely separate centers or "continuation schools," as was the case in some of the sites in Florida and California. Often these programs pilot-tested vocationally oriented curricula designed to provide academically disadvantaged students with salable skills so that they might secure some form of employment after leaving the high school. Vocational educators were almost never involved in the placement of students in these programs. Their participation in the instruction of these students varied depending on the nature of the curricular offerings. When the offerings were heavily oriented toward remediation in the basic skills and vocational education was limited to work experiences, the participation of vocational educators was relatively low. On the other hand, when the curriculum was vocationally oriented, the probability of their participation was high.

Vocational educators, in responding to researchers' inquiries regarding the placement of the academically disadvantaged, often recognized the fact that they were isolated from the placement process and, at the same time, indicated that they might apply differing criteria for placement than those considered most relevant by guidance counselors. For example, in one large urban vocational high school, the Auto Mechanics instructor stated that the criteria he applied for acceptance in his classes were, in descending order of importance, social behavior, interest, and academic achievement. He felt that the past academic record of the student was not the most relevant factor, and he was more concerned about the student's ability to follow instruction, to participate in class as a member of a team without behavioral problems, and to demonstrate an interest in class work. He also felt that student academic achievement could be increased through participation in the class, since the student would have to read instructions, do computations, and do some writing. Very few school personnel addressed the academically disadvantaged along this set of criteria, however.

By applying the criterion of academic achievement, placement almost always resulted in programming the students into remedial classes which were designed to upgrade their reading, writing, and computations skills. Concerns were expressed by some vocational educators that these academically disadvantaged students had a history of participation in compensatory programs and had not benefited from the remedial instructions. Yet, because they had no control of the compensatory funds that were available, seldom did vocational educators have the opportunities to collaborate with the compensatory education staff to develop coordinated programs for the academically disadvantaged students.

4. Most Assessment of Student Academic Achievement Occurred During the Elementary Grades.

Typically, assessment of academic performance of students took place in the elementary grades, in some cases as early as kindergarten. Because of ESEA Title I evaluation requirements, by Grade 3, students were tested on standardized measures at least once, and sometimes twice a year, to measure their academic achievement. Placement in remedial classes and the identification of students as "academically disadvantaged," therefore, usually began by then.

Researchers pressed respondents to indicate what procedures were employed to monitor the delivery of services to the "academically disadvantaged" and to what extent school officials were able to assess the ability of the system to increase the number of students who could participate in regular classes, vocational and/or academic. In most instances, school officials indicated that they did not have a system for monitoring and tracking the performance of students. Thus, once a student was identified as "academically disadvantaged," the possibility existed that that student would be programmed for remedial services throughout his or her tenure in public schools.

By the time students were in Grade 8, school personnel began to program them for high school. Those students whose achievement levels were sufficiently high were programmed for academic courses or the vocational education programs of their choice. Those students who were identified as "academically disadvantaged" were programmed either for remedial classes or for a combination of remedial offerings and special programs in vocational education. These special programs seldom led to licensure or certification in an occupational area or to preparation for further vocational training.

For students who were several years below grade level and over aged, there were serious problems. First, there appeared to be no set procedures for the accurate identification of these students. In some instances they were classified as "learning disabled" and placed in special education programs. In other instances they were classified as "emotionally handicapped" and were placed in either special education or remedial classes. Indeed, school personnel stated that they had the greatest difficulty in dealing with those students whose achievement levels were more than two years below grade level. School personnel who would discuss this issue said that the existing diagnostic instruments were not helpful. They were also aware of the social problems related to poor achievement, especially during the adolescent years; dropout rates and truancy rates increased. Often the attention span of these students was short, mitigating against their successful participation in most academic programs, many remedial programs, and many vocational education programs.

Thus, for many students who were classified as "academically disadvantaged," the frustration for school personnel, for students, and for their parents was the absence of clarity of the nature of the condition: had the system failed the student, or had the student failed the system? Because this population was so large in urban settings, there was little enthusiasm on the part of school personnel to attempt to be more analytical about probable causes and, correspondingly, to be analytical about the services provision or systematic in monitoring the performance of students in the remedial classes.

Of the 15 sites visited by researchers, only two were attempting to develop a system to monitor the performance of the academically disadvantaged population. In the first instance, a small urban center in the northeast, the staff had selected randomly the record of every third student classified as academically disadvantaged to assess student performance and the system's performance. The results were that one-third eventually returned to regular classes, one-third remained in remedial classes throughout their tenure in public school, and one-third bounced back and forth between remedial and regular classes. That school district was now trying to establish a monitoring system based on critical factors such as teacher assignments and student profile so that it could track students and assess delivery of services.

At the other site, a large urban center in the south-central section of the country, school personnel were pilot testing an "Individual Educational Plan" for all students enrolled in ESEA Title I eligible schools in the district. School personnel were impressed with the efficacy and efficiency of the IEP for special education students. They were now trying to establish guidelines for a similar process for all ESEA, Title I students as a means of monitoring student progress and the school system performance for this population.

5. Procedures for Placement of Academically Disadvantaged Students in Vocational Education Classes.

The records of most students were reviewed by school personnel at the end of Grade 8 for placement in senior high school programs. Other factors considered were: (1) classroom teacher recommendations, (2) requests by students, usually as a result of an interview or written request, and (3) sometimes, parental request. In the case of vocational education programs, as requests for entry among the academically achieving students increased, it became more difficult for academically disadvantaged students to get into the programs of their choice. Researchers found that vocational education programs in most sites were oversubscribed. Thus, when academically disadvantaged students requested placement in vocational education programs, often they were not accepted or were placed on waiting lists. In other instances, where school districts operated special or separate programs, they might be programmed into these classes.

While placement of students was generally done by the school guidance counselor, acceptance or rejection of students into programs was usually the prerogative of the receiving vocational education staff. This was especially true of the vocational high schools. Vocational educators indicated that they were pleased with the upsurge in the interest in vocational offerings, since this trend allowed vocational school personnel to pick the more academically talented students. This change in the character of the student body had improved the image of vocational education, they felt. With the wider pool of talent, many vocational school officials often were reluctant to accept students whose academic achievement was below the standard set for admission to certain programs, especially those programs that had licensing or certification requirements. Academically disadvantaged students, therefore, when accepted into regular vocational education programs, were usually accepted into non-licensed or certification programs. However, researchers did find instances in which, as a result of student or parental persistence or intervention by other school personnel, an academically disadvantaged student with high interest in a subject was accepted into a class on "probation" by the classroom teacher.

Thus, while there were standard procedures within school districts regarding the placement of students into secondary school vocational education programs, vocational education staff, particularly those in the vocational high schools had much to say about who was or was not accepted. Additionally, entry into these programs was increasingly predicated on availability of slots, and the ability of students to meet the minimum entry requirements for the programs. The more technical the course, and the more state requirements in terms of number of classroom hours to meet licensure and certification, the greater was the chance that the academic achievement level demanded by the receiving school would be high.

6. At the Community College Level, Procedures for Defining, Identifying, and Placing the Academically Disadvantaged Were Clear and Specific.

Researchers found the procedures employed at the community college level regarding the placement of the academically disadvantaged to be clear and specific. Upon application to the college, the office of admissions reviewed the student's records in terms of grades, performance on college level entrance examinations, and teacher recommendations. Those judged to be capable of entry into regular classes were programmed for those courses. Those in need of some form of remediation were usually required to participate in these programs as a prerequisite for entry into regular classes, or in conjunction with regular classes. Most often, the college advised the student to participate in specially designed remedial programs which were offered during the summer prior to entry. Community college administrators in each of the five states visited indicated that the academically disadvantaged constituted from one-third to one-half of the entering student population for any given year and that the percentages were increasing with each new class of students.

Participation in the placement process was a collegial activity. Policy and standards were usually agreed to by all programs and departments within the college, and student advisement was undertaken both by instructional staff and program services staff. Remedial offerings were usually arrayed under one central office, the Department of Educational Development or Supportive Services, and tended to be highly individualized, allowing for open entry and exit on the part of students. Almost all remedial offerings were competency-based programs, often employing some form of computer-assistance.

In addition to identifying and placing academically disadvantaged students in remedial programs initially upon entrance, students in occupational programs who were experiencing difficulty with language or quantitative concepts were often referred by the individual teachers to the Media or Resource Center for individualized help. In some cases, in Florida in particular, the Center's (the Individualized Manpower Training System) activities were quite structured and the programs were fully automated. In most other instances, however, the colleges employed tutors and aides, often as part of the their work-study programs, who were assigned to work individually or in small groups with the academically disadvantaged students referred to the centers.

7. The CETA System and Community-Based Organizations Devoted Considerable Amounts of Program Effort to Remediation.

Seldom were researchers able to identify community-based organizations that were established solely for the purpose of assisting the academically disadvantaged. Those organizations which existed were established generally for the purpose of increasing the employability of the economically disadvantaged. However, in assessing the needs of the client population, almost all service providers discovered that their clients could not read and write well enough to be able to undertake skills training. Remediation services were provided as a condition for participation in the skills training programs. These services tended to constitute a sizable portion of staff time and program operations. Indeed, most often personnel in CETA-sponsored programs and nonprofit community-based groups stated that, given the academic deficiency of many of their clients, many of their clients were receiving remedial services for extended periods of time. Because of the need to demonstrate a degree of "successful completions" in the CETA system, many of these organizations were instituting rescreening procedures as a condition for acceptance to insure that they were taking in sufficient numbers of clients who could generate the program's ability to reach their quotas. Most often, however, researchers heard community-based personnel say:

> I never knew how bad the situation was. I am amazed at the number of people who have high school diplomas and cannot read and write. It is awful. Something needs to be done about this. There is nothing that we can do for some of them because their problems are so great, and there is no place else to send them. We are usually their last hope and even we can't help them.

C. PLANNING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

1. Most Planning for All Programs for the Acadmically Disadvantaged Was Done at the School District Level.

Because the size of the "disadvantaged" population was so large in most urban areas, and because of the policy of most local school boards regarding the development of basic competency in the areas of reading, language and math, program planning for the academically disadvantaged population generally occurred at the central administrative headquarters. Planning activities usually involved the following considerations:

a. Racial Composition of the Student Body.

Most of the large urban school districts had significant minority populations, and were guided by Office for Civil Rights mandates regarding desegregation of the school system. Planning activities, therefore, had to be sensitive to the racial balance of all programs and classes. The larger the size of both the disadvantaged population and the minority population, the more difficult it became for school personnel to accommodate the twin needs of desegregation and appropriate individual pupil placement in programs responsive to their needs.

b. Funding.

Most of the large urban districts were faced with serious shortages of funds for the operation of their programs. As the tax-base for their respective metropolitan areas eroded, and as local citizenry became concerned about the cost of public education, these systems found themselves under severe financial constraints.

c. Size of the Disadvantaged Population.

Respondents in most urban areas stated that the size of the disadvantaged population enrolled in their systems was great. Many in urban school districts reported that their proportion of the total enrollment often exceeded 50 percent. For these central administrative staff, therefore, the large size of the disadvantaged population imposed limitations on available options for curriculum development, and the quality of services delivery. Given local policies regarding basic skills instructions, most curricular offerings had to address these areas, first and other potential elective programs, second. As a result, the major curriculum efforts focused on the remediation of academic basic skills rather than vocational programs that were typically considered electives.

Respondents indicated that planning techniques first addressed placement of students in remedial classes to upgrade their skills in reading, writing, and computation. When funds were available, attempts were made to insure that teaching staff was trained sufficiently to deliver these basic services, irrespective of the discipline for which they had been trained. Hence, and particularly for the large urban centers, planning techniques focused on a massive effort to deliver basic skills.

2. Vocational Educators Rarely Played a Central Role in Program Planning for Academically Disadvantaged Students.

Because of the emphasis on basic skills development for all students, the role of vocational educators was a minor one. The most prevalent pattern identified was that of two mutually independent sets of operations. In the first, central office staff planned programs for the academically disadvantaged. Where they felt that these students could benefit from placement in vocational education offerings, students were so programmed. Vocational educators were then informed of these decisions and it was then their responsibility to insure that staff and appropriate curriculum were in place to accommodate these students. In the parallel set of operations, vocational education staff did planning for the "regular" vocational education program, which accommodated those students who elected vocational education and had been accepted. Under this pattern, the planning activities did not focus on methods to array the variety of human and other resources available across programs directly on the target population through the vehicle of vocational education, or through any other vehicle, with vocational education playing a role.

3. Planning for Vocational Education Programs for the Academically Disadvantaged Generally Occurred within the Local Schools or Centers Where Programs for this Population were Housed.

In terms of planning for vocational education program services for the academically disadvantaged, researchers found the pattern one in which the planning was done by school staff. Under this pattern, central office vocational education staff had the responsibility for setting priorities for the set-aside vocational educational funds to service this population, and for identifying program priorities.

Central staff informed the building principal and the departmental chairperson for vocational education of the set-aside allocation for that school and of the city-wide priorities. The school building staff then developed those programs which they considered most responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged population.

4. Existing Patterns of Vocational Education Program Planning for the Academically Disadvantaged Mitigated Against Effective Use of Funds.

The absence of any coordinated planning for vocational education services delivery to the academically disadvantaged had implications for the ability of the school system to delivery services to the academically disadvantaged. In large urban centers, the outcome often resulted in the duplication in personnel who delivered services. A typical pattern was the existence of dual vocational education guidance personnel at the central headquarters, and dual vocational guidance personnel at the school building. Within each, seldom did personnel discuss the means for delivery of service to students. Within the guidance departments, one set of counselors, usually called "career" counselors would service most students; the vocational guidance counselors, where they existed, would counsel only those students enrolled in the vocational education programs. Either or both might counsel the academically disadvantaged.

At one large high school in an urban center, there were three sets of counselors. One set, the "regular" guidance counselors, counseled all "regular" students. The other set, the vocational guidance counselor, counseled only those students enrolled in the vocational education offerings. The third sets, the ESEA, Title I, counselor provided counseling only to those students who were classified as "Title I eligible," and only for purposes of remediation and support of performance in reading and mathematics, or for purposes of passing the state or local proficiency tests. In this instance, there were no programs or plans to focus or target personnel and services on the set of problems, academic or vocational, which the academically disadvantaged student might have.

5. The Role of the Advisory Committees Was Limited and Seldom Did the Committees Address the Problems of the Academically Disadvantaged.

At all sites visited there existed advisory committees for vocational education. These committees were generally of two types:the local advisory committee to the system-wide department of vocational education, and the local trade advisory committees to the respective school department of vocational education.

In the first instance membership tended to come from upper administrative levels of business, industry, labor, post-secondary vocational education. Often, representatives were some of the most prominent leaders in the local community. Many of these committees, as in the case of Jacksonville, Florida, had played significant roles in altering the image of vocational education in the community, in helping to establish skills and vocational centers within the local public school system, and in helping to secure funding for the construction of these centers and the equipping of the classrooms. In general, these committees played essential public relations, financial development, and policymaking roles.

In the other set of committees, representation generally came from the middle management level of business, industry, labor, and post-secondary vocational education. These individuals were usually owners of small business establishments and supervisory personnel or department heads with the responsibility for direct supervision of employees or development of training programs within their establishment. They assisted the local school most often in its curriculum development effort and also provided assistance in placements for the various work-study and cooperative education programs undertaken by the schools.

Though the vocational education legislation indicated that the composition of the advisory committees should be broad, including representation from community-based groups and organizations and advocates for the various disadvantaged populations, researchers rarely found such representation on the system-wide committee. This absence of community and/or advocacy involvement in program planning for the disadvantaged often created conflicts between the disadvantaged and minority community and the local school system. On several occasions, advocates for the disadvantaged and minority communities stated that they were concerned about their lack of participation in planning school programs for the disadvantaged. Most felt that this absence resulted in two negative sets of outcomes. First, many minority and disadvantaged youths were programmed into vocational education programs, irrespective of their desires. Respondents indicated that in these cases, programs were changed most often as a result of parental intervention and sometimes as a result of sensitive school personnel intervention.

Second, minority students were often programmed into vocational education courses that did not prepare them for the better paying jobs, or for apprenticeship training. Respondents stated that where minority and disadvantaged students were in vocational education programs, the programs tended to be traditional and not in the "mainstream" of technological and scientific development.

Indeed, researchers found, though they did not perform a "head count" in every instance, that the enrollment patterns of minority and disadvantaged students tended to be as stated by these respondents; this was true for both the public school and community college levels. In general, there appeared to be a high degree of minority female participation in courses in Home Economics and beginning Office Practice; but very low representation in those Nursing or Cosmetology courses that required an examination for licensing purposes. There tended to be a high degree of minority male participation in courses in Building Maintenance, Masonry, Food Preparation, and occasionally Auto Mechanics. There was very low minority male participation in courses in Drafting, Construction Trades, and in Electronics.

6. There Were Significant Differences Between the Types of Personnel Involved in the Planning of Programs for the Academically Disadvantaged and for Vocational Education.

Researchers were constantly confronted by the differences between types of personnel who were engaged in program planning activities for the disadvantaged and for vocational education. In general, personnel who were engaged in the planning and operation of programs for the disadvantaged mirrored a high involvement of women and minorities, reflected an age-grouping in the early-to-mid-thirties, most often possessed professional or doctoral degrees, and were urban in their perspective. This group also seemed to be prone to experimenting with a variety of programmatic options to meet student needs and were interested in developing the various data bases that could be used for systematic program design, development and assessment.

By contrast, staffs in vocational education were overwhelmingly male. Without exception, the director of vocational education for the system or the departmental chair was male, and all staff, except for the Home Economics teachers or supervisors, were male, as well. The average age tended to be forty and above; most were at retirement or about to retire. Indeed, in one large vocational high school in an eastern city, the departmental chairperson expressed concern about the fate of the programs if replacements in the various disciplines were not forthcoming. The average length of service of his staff was thirty years, and the average age was fifty-five. Moreover, the increments in salary and wages for craftspersons in private industry had risen, contributing to the inability of the system to recruit new staff.

The attitude of vocational educators tended to be conservative; that is, they felt that existing strategies were responsive to the needs of students, and, therefore, there was no need for experimentation. In this regard, most were encouraged by the increasingly positive image which vocational education was enjoying in their communities, and were relishing the fact that they could now be more selective about student participation in their programs. As one instructor stated: "We never liked the fact that we were a dumping ground for less able students. But, there was little we could do about it. Now, however, people have finally come to realize that we have much to offer for the more academically talented students, and the skills we teach can lead to earnings as good as those who complete college." Researchers came to expect the anecdotes about the recent high school graduate in diesel mechanics who was earning more than the teachers on the school staff.

7. At the Community College Level, Planning for the Disadvantaged Was Specific to Individual Needs and Programs.

Researchers found a very high degree of consistency at the community college level regarding the planning process for the academically disadvantaged. The process involved representation from the spectrum of programs and departments at the college that serviced the population. Because the academically disadvantaged population was increasing, it was not unusual for the process to involve staff at the highest administrative levels; that is, participation in these activities would include personnel at the level of deans and departmental chairs, and not just at the coordinator level.

Planning tended to be undertaken by committees that set priorities and identified aspects of the services needed by the population. Within the committee structure, personnel identified the numbers of students to be involved, the methods to be employed to insure services delivery to all of the population, and the variety of human and other resources that were necessary. Additionally, committees spent a good deal of time identifying gaps in services, and recommending administrative responses to these gaps. Most often, recommendations were made to develop proposals for additional program funds to permit service to a needy subpopulation of students.

The planning process at the community college level provided for the harnessing of the cross section of resources within the institution to focus on insuring that students' needs were being met. Where discrepencies existed, the committees identified them and recommended possible courses of action. Roles and responsibilities regarding services provided to the academically disadvantaged and mechanisms for coordination of services were also clearly delineated.

8. Community-Based Organizations and CETA-Sponsored Programs Operated Independently of the Vocational Education Programs and Programs for the Disadvantaged in the Local Schools.

With the exception of those CETA-sponsored programs for youth which were contracted to the local school system for operation, community-based organizations and agencies and CETA-sponsored programs operated independently of the local school systems. The outcome of this independence was that opportunities for program coordination and sharing of facilities and staffs were minimal or nonexistent. Additionally, in many sites, there had been the development of a "protection of turf" mentality. It was not unusual for CETA-sponsored programs that operated programs in Auto Mechanics to be housed in a facility just a short distance from the local high school or vocational school where there were programs in Auto Mechanics. With few exceptions, this separation of programs was prevalent across sites, irrespective of size.

A major problem for job-training programs in rural and small towns, for example, was that of transportation. Yet, manpower planning specialists in several programs stated that all negotiations with local independent school districts to rent high school facilities in order to service local eligible clients in their communities had failed or were stalled. As one specialist indicated, "The independent school districts are fiercely independent. Most view CETA as welfare and feel that society should not pay again for the education of a person who did not avail himself of the opportunity for that education during adolescence."

On the other hand, many school administrators, faced with increasingly tight budgets, felt that much of the money supporting alternative community-based job-training and education programs was ill-spent. The superintendent of a large school district in the Southwest was adamant about his perception that federal labor funds were undermining the public school system, at a time when the system was undergoing unnecessarily harsh and ill-deserved criticism. He stated that the public schools were servicing more of the disadvantaged than any other public agency, at a higher level of service with more regard for equity, and yet was receiving no recognition. "We could operate a program for training people for entry level jobs in computer technology better than anyone alse in the community," he said, "but the 'feds' give the money to a community-based group which will waste the funds, and which doesn't have the expertise or the personnel to operate a successful program. We have, but we are never considered for the contract."

D. STRATEGIES FOR SERVICING THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. The Primary Strategy for the Academically Disadvantaged Was The Provision of Remediation in Basic Skills Areas.

Consistent with the policy of most local education agencies that the major thrust of education should be the development of competencies in areas of reading, computation, and language arts, the concommitant strategy for the academically disadvantaged was that of placement in classes for remediation. When students were to go to the high school level, their records were reviewed in accordance with the requirements for entry, and their performance on state or local proficiency examinations.

Whether a student desired to attend a vocational high school, an area vocational center, or a comprehensive high school with vocational offerings, the student would be programmed into the remedial classes available to address his or her deficiencies. In many instances, completion of and/or successful preformance on state or local competency exams was a prerequisite for attendance in regular vocational education classes.

2. **Vocational Education and Remedial Instruction in the Basic Skills Seldom Were Provided in a Joint Program for the Academically Disadvantaged.**

The strategies available to school administrators for the provision of instruction for the academically disadvantaged tended to be those of: remediation, apart from participation in vocational instruction, or any other elective offerings; a combination of remediation and vocational instruction; and, vocational instruction and some types of work experience. Most strategies for the academically disadvantaged were those of remediation, apart from participation in other types of elective programs. Seldom was the strategy of using vocational education as the means of helping to remediate deficiencies in basic skills employed. Researchers, however, did identify two sets of unique programs in which this strategy was implemented. In both instances, there were major incentives for testing this alternative.

In Jacksonville, Florida, academically disadvantaged students who were participating in vocational education programs could take advantage of the Individualized Manpower Training System (IMTS) centers located in the separate skills centers. The IMTS centers were used as a strategy to service academically disadvantaged students in over 90 sites throughout the State of Florida. Not all academically disadvantaged students attending the Duval County skills centers were programmed directly into the IMTS centers. Nor was it the case that only the students identified as academically disadvantaged attended the IMTS centers. Rather, the vocational education teachers at the skills centers referred students who experienced difficulty with academic concepts related to the particular vocation to spend time at the IMTS center during part of the day. The work at the IMTS was individualized, automated and, in most cases, related to the vocational training. Thus, the identification process by the vocational education teachers at this level was very informal, although records were kept when the students reported to the IMTS center since the school received reimbursement from the State on the basis of time students spent at the centers.

Initially, some VEA set-aside funds for disadvantaged students were used to purchase materials for the IMTS centers. Recently, however, the centers, including the salaries for the instructional manager and two aides, were funded through State funds for Compensatory Programs. The Florida State formula for reimbursements to LEAs for compensatory programs was twice that for regular academic programs. Thus, the funds available to Florida LEAs for programs targeted to academically disadvantaged was significantly greater than the VEA set-aside allocations for the disadvantaged.

In New York City, VEA set-aside funds were used to support an After School Occupational Skills Program. During school year 1977-78, the program served a total of 10,705 students in 26 high schools and two alternative sites. At each center, the program provided students with occupation skills courses after school for four hours a week for 30 weeks. The program provided job development assistance, placed students in part-time employment, provided for individual and group guidance services, and for field trips to industry. Although it was aimed at the disadvantaged students who had reading deficiencies, language handicaps, or who had failed more courses than they had passed, the program was open to all other interested students as well.

There was no student credit for participation in the program and instruction was provided in modular units, enabling students to obtain entry-level skills at multiple levels of the instructional program. With the completion of a sufficient number of modules, a student could master the skills necessary for job placement. Although the program was considered successful, as evidenced by the fact that city tax-levy funds increasingly supported its implementation (approximately 55 percent), there were concerns on the part of some respondents as to whether the program served the needs of the academically disadvantaged. Two factors were noted. First, the program, conducted after regular school hours, was optional and voluntary. Thus, considerable motivation on the part of the students was required for attendance. Since academically disadvantaged students for a variety of reasons often lacked the necessary motivation, many enrolled and dropped out very quickly. Second, in comparison to some of the more technical occupational offerings available in some of New York City's vocational education high schools, the options available through this program were not as comprehensive. Nevertheless, the program was aimed at teaching students who could not qualify for the vocational high school programs salable entry level skills, an opportunity that would not be otherwise available to them.

Despite the fact that New York City, like most major urban school districts, was encountering severe financial problems in maintaining its basic programs as the tax-levy base eroded, the system was able to develop alternative programs to meet the needs of the academically disadvantaged population because the amount of federal VEA money available was sizable. The Center for Career and Occupational Education was created by the Board of Education to develop and coordinate vocational and career education efforts in New York City. In the 1979-80 school year, the Center was elevated to division status, and provided technical assistance in the area of occupational and vocational programs to the districts and the high schools. Funds available for programs for the disadvantaged, through the set-asides, amounted to just under $4 million. Thus, even though the system was vast, sufficient funds could be aggregated and coordinated with vocational education tax-levy funds to develop alternative programs that affected a sizable portion of the disadvantaged population in the system.

3. In Small and Rural School Districts, the Strategy Was One of Individualized Instruction.

As the planning process tended to be informal in small and rural school districts, so, too, were the strategies for providing instruction to the academically disadvantaged. Most of the rural and small city sites visited by researchers had very few academically disadvantaged students, as measured by performance in class (grades) and performance on state or local competency exams. To the contrary, if data available to researchers were correct, student performance in small and rural districts tended to be substantially higher than performance in the larger urban areas.

In the small and rural districts, local education agencies placed emphasis on individualized instruction. Each instructor was expected to assist the academically disadvantaged students on a personal basis and to make curricular adjustments accordingly. Vocational programs were generally housed in a department in the local or county comprehensive high school. In some instances there were area vocational centers that serviced a consortia of counties. Whichever the case, the home school was expected to provide the supportive and remedial services that the academically disadvantaged student needed.

At one rural site in west-central Texas, the vocational industrial arts teacher explained how the strategy worked. He stated:

> I know what a student can do. If a student has difficulty with reading, then I give the exam orally. When the student is about to graduate and needs a recommendation, I explain to the potential employer that John has good work habits, gets along well with others, and can do the job, provided that instructions are oral. Most want someone who is a good worker anyway, and poor reading skills probably won't hurt his chances for employment in most instances in this part of the state.

4. Almost All Vocational Programs Developed for the Academically Disadvantaged Incorporated Some Form of Work-Experience.

When researchers found programs for the academically disadvantaged, almost all incorporated some kind of work experience. Students in these programs often began the curriculum in Grade 9, where they were introduced to a variety of generic skills in various entry level occupational clusters. By Grade 10 they were involved in the intermediate level of skills development. In Grade 11 they usually worked at a site for one-half day, earning the minimum wage. During Grade 12, they continued to work, sometimes for a semester, or continuing at one-half day. Most of the work experience programs provided training for entry level jobs in certain areas: Small Machine Repair, Food Service, Building Maintenance, and Office Practice. The more severe the academic disadvantagement, however, the more limited were the options. For example, students who had serious reading and writing deficiencies were seldom involved in Office Practice, where minimal skills were required, but might more likely be found in Building Maintenance or Food Service programs.

The job training aspect was essential to the "special" or "alternative" programs which researchers identified. In Jacksonville, Florida, for example, two separate academic vocational education options were available to academically disadvantaged students. The first, a recently developed secondary alternative education program, provided a combination of separate instruction for academic courses and regular instruction for occupational training to severely academically disadvantaged students. The second option, a separate academic and vocational program administered at the John E. Ford Career Center, was available for academically disadvantaged students who were also "socially maladjusted." Although one of the objectives for both programs was to provide students marketable entry-level occupational skills, neither was considered a vocational program. Indeed, the programs were planned and developed by the central office "academic" staff and were funded primarily with state dollars for compensatory/alternative education programs. Some VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged were used, however, to update shop equipment at the Career Center. Since the programs were unique in the way academic education, vocational training and work experiences were combined, a brief description of each follows.

The most recent in-school alternative education program was developed as a strategy to retain disinterested and severely academically disadvantaged students in school and to provide them with the vocational and "functional literacy" skills needed for getting meaningful jobs in the community. By the end of Grade 6, eligible students were recommended to the program by the school staff and had to receive the consent of the parents or guardians in order to participate since, once in the program, they could not earn credits toward the regular diploma.

The program curriculum, although nongraded, was divided into six one-year instructional segments beginning in Grade 7. Year One was spent at the Seventh Grade Centers, and the second year at one of the 23 junior high schools. For the four remaining years, the students were placed in one of the fifteen high schools in the county. The regular high school curriculum was a three-year sequence, thus, these academically disadvantaged students were allowed four years to complete the typical three-year vocational education sequence. During the first year of the program, an individualized assessment was made to determine the appropriate instructional level and an IEP was developed for each student. The program content during Year One included: functional skills, knowledge of community services, consumer skills, physical education and the "vocational wheel." The vocational wheel program provided a range of hands-on experiences in a variety of occupations. The program was totally self-contained except for physical education.

During the second year at the junior high schools, the students pursued their academic training but were also provided with career guidance and occupational counseling. The emphasis was on diagnosing vocational aptitudes and interests, and on helping the students make "realistic" vocational choices. The curriculum also included employability skills. Beginning with years 3-6 at the high schools, the students' time was divided into three two-hour blocks for basic skills academic education (separate classes), electives (regular school classes), and vocational education (regular school classes). The students had to forego the elective option if they had to travel to one of the Skills Centers for vocational training. During the fifth and sixth years, the students, depending on their progress in the vocational programs and their skills level, were eligible for on-the-job training, either for half-day (Year Five) or a full day (Year Six). The program was only in its second year of operation and there were no data to determine its effects, although respondents were very enthusiastic.

The John E. Ford Career Center served approximately 480 students who, in addition to being academically disadvantaged, were also considered discipline and behavior problems for reasons other than emotional and/or psychological. In addition to staff referrals, many of the students were placed in the Center on the recommendation of the juvenile courts. The curriculum offered some academic basic skills instruction as well as 15 different vocational/occupational courses including Horticulture, Food Service Management and Distribution, Clothing Manufacturing, Masonry, Graphic Arts Occupations, Small Engine Repair, Woodworking, Shoe Repair and Leatherwork, and various other trades. There was also a work-study component providing jobs for 24 economically disadvantaged students.

The Center had a high turnover rate since many of the students were past the compulsory education age and some attended classes to learn a trade and then leave when they had a job. The staff, including the principal, twelve teachers, two counselors, and six supervisors appeared to be highly motivated and genuinely interested in helping the students make the most of this opportunity which, according to some respondents, was "their last chance to make it."

Other unique strategies for serving academically disadvantaged students were identified as well. In Poughkeepsie, New York, an arrangement between a local community-based organization and the local public schools had resulted in the development of alternative programs for "potential dropouts." The Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center's Career Intern Program was one of four national demonstration programs based on an experimental model, funded by the National Institute of Education. The program identified "potential dropouts" in a local system and tailored a program to the students' needs, addressing the students' academic and vocational/career development. Identification of the "potential dropout" varied, but generally included characteristics related to age, attendance patterns, dissatisfaction with academic coursework, and some behavioral problems in the local school. Students were referred by the school, though, in a few instances, parents had volunteered their children for participation.

Upon acceptance, students were given a battery of tests to identify their level of competency in reading and math, and they were interviewed to identify their career/vocational interests. A plan for both academic and career/vocational development was established and was used to monitor student performance on a regular basis. An essential element of the program was the opportunity for students to participate in some career/vocational development activity, allowing students to gain "hands-on" experiences in a work setting while receiving some pay for their labor.

5. At the Community College Level, Emphasis Was on Individualized Instruction for the Academically Disadvantaged.

Though the names for the delivery of services often varied, researchers found a high degree of consistency in the patterns employed at the community college level for servicing the academically disadvantaged. The typical pattern involved (a) identification of the students by transcript or teacher recommendation at the time of application for admission, and (2) placement of students in remediation courses, either prior to entry, during an intensive summer program, or after entry, as a part of the regular academic year. Remedial courses generally carried no credit. In most instances, participation was mandatory, and students could not be fully matriculated until they had completed a set number of courses, or demonstrated proficiency on a standardized exam.

For students who were experiencing difficulty in classes, most often, the classroom instructor referred the student to a resource center for assistance, or the students volunteered him or herself for service. Services were generally provided in a center, often as a part of the Library Media Center or Guidance Department. Assistance could be in the form of tutors, programmed instruction, either textbook or computer-based, or small group instruction. Courses were usually on an open entry, open exit basis, allowing students to move freely between remedial services and regular classes at their own pace.

In many of the large urban areas, the size of the programs for the academically disadvantaged was enormous, equalling or surpassing the size of the campuses of some of the major post-secondary institutions. In Chicago, Illinois, for example, the Chicago Urban Skills Institute, a unit of the Chicago city-wide college system, serviced some 33,000 students annually. The major missions of the Institute were to provide adult educational services to persons who did not possess either a secondary school diploma or General Education Development (GED) credentials and to prepare adults for entry level employment in one of several fields of employment for which the Institute provided training.

6. Community-Based Organizations and CETA-Sponsored Programs Provided Remedial Instruction for the Academically Disadvantaged as a Part of Their Employment and Training Programs.

Though researchers seldom found organizations that had been established solely to provide remedial instruction in the basic skills, they did find that CETA-sponsored employment and training programs for the economically disadvantaged spent considerable time in providing remediation services in basic skills. Services delivery varied, but offerings generally included some instruction in the basic skills (ABE), and often GED training. Program directors and planners stated that in most instances, the basic skills proficiency of clients was so low that attention had to be devoted to the acquisition of a minimum level of competency, prior to participation in the occupational offerings.

In some CETA-sponsored programs, because of the "successful completion" ratio an organization had to maintain as a basis for recycling of the program, the policy was instituted to rescreen applicants. As one director stated, "When you accept them, you are stuck with them."

Researchers could not help but be struck by the existence of an almost "parallel" educational system that was being supported by CETA funds. If time, money, and level of program effort were considered as the key variables, then some CETA programs were spending 50 percent or more of their efforts in attention of remediation of educational deficiencies for the academically disadvantaged. In short, the academically disadvantaged student who failed the system or were failed by the system of public education, if picked up by the CETA system, participated in remediation programs again, as a prerequisite for placement in the occupational and training programs. The setting and personnel were different, but the problems were the same.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

1. The Amount of the VEA Set-Aside for Disadvantaged Students Was Generally Very Small and, Therefore, Insufficient to Make an Impact on Vocational Education Programs for Academically Disadvantaged Students.

VEA legislation and guidelines regarding the costs of services for handicapped and disadvantaged students who required special services specify that the set-asides be used only to pay the "excess cost" of those services when those populations were in regular vocational education classes. During the study, researchers probed to discover how these costs were determined, the amount of funds received by local education agencies, and how these funds were applied.

Data provided to researchers indicated that in almost all cases, the amount of the set-aside was very small; less than $1,000 for small towns and many rural counties, and often less than $5,000 after redistribution to the various schools in large urban areas. Funds were generally distributed to local school buildings and directly administered by the building administrator. Most often, the administrator would be given his or her allocation by central office vocational education administrators, and would then submit vouchers for services.

Two strategies were identified with regard to the distribution of the set aside funds to schools. In some cases, such as in Modesto, California, and in Jacksonville, Florida, the funds were divided and distributed to all high schools that administered vocational programs on the basis of formulae that accounted for total enrollment, academic achievement and socioeconomic status of the student populations. The funds were then budgeted by each school based on the priorities established by the principal and the school staff but guided by central office policies and guidelines. Since each school shared the total district allocation, the funds available tended to be limited and they were used most often to hire an aide or part-time teacher to provide tutoring or remedial instruction to those academically disadvantaged students experiencing difficulty in the vocational education classes.

The second strategy used, particularly in New York City and in some of the larger community colleges (e.g., the Peralta Community College District that operated five campuses in Oakland, California), depended more on competitive proposals submitted by the various schools to the local central administration. Typically, the central administrators, working with representatives from the local schools, established the program priorities and the standards for judging quality of proposed projects. The information was then forwarded to the local schools and each was asked to submit a proposal based on local needs and interests for establishing programs for the disadvantaged. Funding decisions were then made after review of the proposal submitted by the local schools. This distribution strategy, although resulting in the exclusion of some schools from participation in the programs, allowed for greater flexibility in the use of the VEA set-aside funds and stimulated the development of innovative and pilot vocational programs for disadvantaged students.

2. The "Excess Cost" Provision of the VEA Legislation Was Rarely Understood by Local School Building Administrators.

Researchers were struck by the fact that most administrators of schools and vocational education programs at the local building level, where such programs were housed, seldom understood the nature of the "excess cost" provision of the VEA legislation. As researchers probed during interviews, it appeared that the lack of knowledge about this provision was due to three factors. First, in many of the smaller districts, the amount of funds was so small as to be insignificant. Administrators, therefore, did not concern themselves with this issue. Attention was given to other aspects of program development and operation that needed their attention. Moreover, in many of the small rural districts, because of the very small size of the population that was disadvantaged, no VEA set-aside funds were received.

Second as the size of the disadvantaged populations increased, the issue for school administrators was that of service to the majority. When the disadvantaged students' population became the majority, the problem focus changed. The approach of school administrators in the large urban centers was that their programs must focus on this majority, and, therefore, the special programs were considered standard.

Lastly, the process for administration of the funds varied in terms of the amount of fiscal autonomy a school building administrator had. In some states, the VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged were handled at the state level. School districts (or local education agencies) were told their allocation. They then billed the state agency for those services according to the guidelines established. Moreover, those guidelines varied. Some states, for example, required that the school districts develop proposals to demonstrate how the funds would be used; others did not.

In other states, the process was more decentralized. That is, the apportioned amount for the local education agency was given to the school district. The school district, in turn, either reallocated the funds to the respective units, or as was the case in New York City required that the units (school buildings) submit proposals for funding of programs and services.

Researchers found that as the amount of autonomy at the local building decreased, the less school administrators knew about the "excess cost" provision. Conversely, as autonomy increased, the more they knew; but, with this responsibility came the concern that, given the size of the allocation, the costs of administration of the small amount of funds were disproportionately high.

3. The VEA Legislative Requirements of Matching Funds by the States Had Not Created any New Monies to Service the Needs of the Academically Disadvantaged in Terms of Their Participation in Vocational Education Programs.

The clear intent of the Congress by establishing a "matching" requirement on the part of the states was that these populations be given priority consideration, that problems regarding services for these populations be resolved, and that the states and local education agencies develop policies, plans, and programs that would be responsive to the needs of this population. In general, researchers did not find this to be the case. To the contrary, the data culled from the review of the various state one- and five-year vocational education plans indicated that for the majority of the states in the study, there were serious problems related to the use of the matching funds. For example, The committee on the special needs population for the Texas State Education Agency, in its report, stated that the local education agencies were underutilizing funds available to service the needs of the disadvantaged and that funds were being carried over from year to year at a rate of some 13 percent. The committee strongly recommended that the Texas State Education Agency play a more vigorous role in encouraging local education agencies to be more responsive in the development of programs to service the special needs populations.

4. Set-Aside Funds Were Seldom Combined with Other State, Federal, or Local Program Funds in the Development of Programs for the Disadvantaged.

Even though researchers were able to identify a variety of local, state, and federal programs that had the academically disadvantaged student as the focus, seldom did researchers find planning and developmental activities that attempted to combine these services in order to have maximum effect on the population. As stated above (see "Planning"), planning activities for the academically disadvantaged population tended to occur independently of the operation of vocational programs and classes. When those special remedial services were provided by and within the vocational education programs for the academically disadvantaged population, they, too, were independent of other remedial programs that existed in the school districts. The exceptions identified by researchers were found in the State of Florida, and in the Public Schools of New York City.

5. The Role of the Compensatory Education Programs at the State Department of Education Assumed Increasing Importance for the Academically Disadvantaged as States Instituted Competency Testing.

While VEA set-aside funds for the provisions of special services for the academically disadvantaged students were relatively small in most cases, researchers discovered that state funds for the provisions of remedial services for the same populations were sizable in those states that had instituted competency testing and compensatory programs to help students pass the tests. Thus, the state compensatory education programs' role tended to supersede the role played by other school administrators at local education levels regarding the planning and development of services for the academically disadvantaged students. In two of the states included in the study, New York and Florida, researchers had the opportunity to observe some of the outcomes of this phenomenon.

In the State of Florida, for example, the State Programs for Compensatory and Alternative Education appeared to support fully the cost of the provision of remedial services for the academically disadvantaged population. VEA set-aide funds were used to support special programs, such as the IMTS Centers and, in come cases, special programs that focused on the provision of vocational services. In Jacksonville, Florida, for example, VEA set-aside funds had been used to support the John E. Ford Career Center for severely academically disadvantaged students. The funds, however, were used to purchase and replace equipment and materials for some of the vocational programs offered at the Center rather than to provide "excess cost" services to the students. The justification was that extra services were already being provided to those students through the State Compensatory and Alternative Education funds and that the VEA set-aside funds were used where they could be most effective, "to upgrade the programs and insure that these students were provided with learning experiences that were relevant to current industry practices."

In the State of New York, a similar program and program office existed to service the needs of "Pupils With Special Educational Needs" (PSENs). The State, as in the case of Florida, also provided large sums of money to support those remedial services needed to help students who were severely academically disadvantaged. This funding allowed local school districts to reallocate VEA set-aside funds to meet the needs of the academically disadvantaged in unique ways. In the case of New York City, the Center for Career and Occupational Education, which administered the VEA funds in the city public schools, had used these funds to develop a variety of alternative programs such as the After School Instructional Program to provide academically disadvantaged students with opportunities to participate in special programs designed to teach them specific occupational skills. The result was that on an annual basis, at least some 10,000 academically disadvantaged students, who might not have participated in vocational programs, had the opportunity to do so.

6. At the Community College Level VEA Set-Asides for the Academically Disadvantaged Were Generally Used to Support Pilot Programs and/or to Provide Maximum Support for Existing Programs.

At the community colleges included in the study, researchers identified a set of clear processes that were used to allocate the VEA setasides for the academically disadvantaged. In some instances, the funds were used to develop pilot programs addressing newly identified needs of the population, or to identify a subpopulation that needed special attention. At Dutchess County Community College in Dutchess County, New York, for example, VEA set-aside funds had been used to help the college develop remedial programs to enable it to do a better job of servicing the academic deficiences of increasing numbers of minority disadvantaged students, many of whom were referred by the Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Program (HVOIC). College administrators admitted that they were not doing as good a job as they would like, but that the funds had enabled them to test a variety of materials that might be appropriate for this subgroup. The college had also used the VEA set-asides for developing pilot programs to attract both male and female students to nontraditional programs. As a result, female participation in many traditionally male-dominated programs had increased incrementally by about 5 percent per year over the past three years, and the participation of male students in female-dominated programs such as Nursing, has increased dramatically as well.

In other instances, the funds were used to increase the size and scope of the ongoing remedial and support services programs. Community college administrators all stated that the size of the academically disadvantaged student population continued to increase. Hence, in many instances, the VEA set-asides were used to increase proportionately the size of staff, full-time personnel or tutors, to purchase additional materials and equipment, and/or to provide more remedial units for existing programs. In all instances, however, the process at the community college level involved overall program planning, utilizing staffs from across the colleges' administrations and programs so as to insure that funds were aligned to produce the greatest possible outcomes.

7. Participation in and Use of VEA Funds by Community-Based Groups Was Very Limited.

Researchers were able to identify only two instances of use of VEA funds by groups other than local education and community college agencies for purposes other than school-based programs. Both examples were very small, and both involved the development of some planning activity which incorporated participation from the broad spectrum of education, employment, and training agencies and organizations in the locale.

Most community-based organizations included in the study, it should be mentioned, received most of their funding from CETA and did not consider the use of VEA funds. The exception was the Hudson Valley OIC in Poughkeepsie, New York, which did receive some VEA set-aside funds to provide remedial programs for many of its clients. In this regard, it should be mentioned that the HVOIC program administrators were very sophisticated and had done a thorough job of identifying all possible funding options for their various programs. However, program officers stated that securing the funds was a difficult process, almost to discourage application.

In the other instance, VEA funds were used to support part of the cost of the operation of an Industry/Education Council. Located in Poughkeepsie, New York, the Council was using both VEA and CETA, Title VII funds to establish the Council, and to develop the mechanism for planning a variety of integrated programs to tap the resources of all agencies and organizations engaged in the delivery or provision of education, training, and employment services throughout the Dutchess County area.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

The data base for this study was limited to interviews with a variety of respondents and to the review of printed materials made available at each site. Sometimes there was a high degree of consensus about the nature of programs; often, there was not. Researchers, therefore, had to weigh the logic and quality of data offered in the various interviews, their own observations, and data culled from the variety of printed materials. The "effects" listed below, therefore, are relative and do not imply "success" or "failure." Rather, they indicate the best inferences that could be drawn from the evidence available.

1. The Development of Competency in the Basic Skills of Literacy, Writing, and Computation Was Considered by School Policymakers, School Administrators, Teachers, and Parents to be the Primary Role of the Public Schools; Hence, the Major Problem for School Administrators Regarding the Academically Disadvantaged Was the Development of These Competencies.

It is safe to say that as far as policy, planning, and program implementation for the academically disadvantaged was concerned, the priority was that of the development of competency in basic skills. Schools viewed this as their primary role and society expected them to fulfill this mission. Accordingly, students identified as deficient in reading, writing and/or arithmetic were programmed into classes intended to develop those skills.

2. In General, Vocational Educators Were Isolated from Central Program Staff who Planned and Administered the Compensatory Programs for Academically Disadvantaged Students.

Because of the priority focus on basic skills at the local education agency level, the major roles in the planning and development of compensatory programs for academically disadvantaged were assumed by central staff, usually at the superintendency level. Vocational educators were, as a rule, not involved in such activities. Central office administrators tended to develop programs of two types. The first was to program students who were academically deficient into remedial classes as their primary educational curriculum. Participation in such classes often precluded the ability of these students to participate in elective programs such as vocational education. The second type was to place academically deficient students into "separate" or "special" vocational education programs that combined vocational skill development and work experience. Academic skills development needed for success in those special classes was limited and in some cases, related to the vocational nature of the programs. The first type of programming was most prevalent. The second type was occasionally seen, especially for "severely" disadvantaged students.

Vocational educators, therefore, had a limited role in the planning of, and implementation of support-type programs for the academically disadvantaged students in the regular vocational programs. When these students were present, vocational educators "counted heads" to insure that the local district could account for and receive reimbursement for any additional services ("excess costs") that might be provided to the district. They did have, however, a role to play in the planning and implementation of the separate programs, since often these programs were supported with VEA funds. However, even then, the academic offerings were apart from the vocational offerings and the activities were planned and taught by separate staffs.

3. The Numbers of Students Enrolled in Vocational Education Programs and Classes Was Small, and the Number of Academically Disadvantaged Students Enrolled in Vocational Education Programs Was Miniscule.

A major problem for researchers was that of tracking the number of academically disadvantaged students who were enrolled in vocational education programs. Identification of students was complicated by several factors. The definition/identification process was in many cases, unclear. As mentioned in Section B, "Definitions and Identification," "disadvantaged" had many denotations and connotations. Coupled with the isolation of vocational educators from that process, figures provided by central office staffs were often at variance with those provided by vocational education administrators. This definition/identification problem was exacerbated by the size of the enrollments in the local school district. The larger the student enrollment, the more difficult it was to identify and track students. The most glaring case was that of New York City, in which estimates of the enrollments provided to researchers varied as much as 25 percent among respondents. The final factor was that of desegregation. In most of the large urban centers, school administrators were concerned about racial balance in the respective classes and programs. Thus, given the varying definitions of the "disadvantaged," researchers seldom knew if the "disadvantaged" referred to the numbers and percentages of minority youth, of minority youth with academic difficulties, of minority youth who were from low-income families, or of minority youth who were both from low-income families and were academically disadvantaged. Whenever researchers pressed this point with administrators, typically the final response suggested that the programs did not make those types of distinctions among the populations called "disadvantaged."

The priority focus on compensatory education by the local education agencies mitigated against the participation of many academically disadvantaged students in regular vocational education programs. When these students did participate in regular vocational programs, their numbers were very small. If they participated in relatvely large numbers, their participation was usually in separate or special vocational education programs, administered independently of other school-based compensatory education programs.

4. Seldom Was Vocational Education Seen as the Vehicle for the Provision of Remedial Services for Academically Disadvantaged Students in Terms of the Development of Basic Skills Competency.

Since program strategies were based on an identification process independent of factors that might lead to success in regular vocational education programs (e.g., interest, motivation, vocational skills), little attention had been given to vocational education as a possible vehicle for helping to develop basic skills competencies for the academically disadvantaged. Researchers were able to identify only a few examples of programs in which vocational education was seen as an alternative vehicle for the development of such competencies. When such programs existed, vocational educators and central office administrators were concerned that disproportionately high ratios of minority youth in such classes would be seen by the local minority communities as evidence of the school system's attempt to depress the higher education aspirations which that community held for its youth. VEA legislation makes clear that the intent of the set-asides is to help them to succeed in vocational education programs. However, researchers found that neither program planning and development nor student identification and placement procedures addressed the specification of those special services within the vocational education context. Rather, the context was invariably predicated on considerations independent of vocational education.

5. The Requirements of Competency Testing Affected Vocational Education Programs and Options for Academically Disadvantaged Students.

Two direct effects on vocational education programs and options for academically disadvantaged students could be identified as a result of state and local requirements for competency testing of high school students. In the first instance, the basic proficiency requirements had a constraining effect on the vocational options and opportunities for vocationally oriented students who failed these tests. Since vocational education was considered an elective option, if students wanted to graduate from high school with a regular diploma, the priority was on enrollment in remedial academic classes designed to help them pass the exams. However, in most cases, these classes were in addition to the required courses that the students had to take and, moreover, the classes tended to be scheduled at the same time the vocational programs were conducted. Consequently, the academically disadvantaged were forced to drop vocational education courses in order to take the remedial preparatory courses. In many cases, the basic proficiency requirements were related to a "back to basics" movement which concerned many vocational educators. In response to public pressure, some districts in Florida, California, and New York in particular, had adopted additional academic course requirements for graduation. These policies made it more difficult, especially for academically disadvantaged students to participate in the regular vocational programs and still complete successfully the academic requirements for graduation.

Paradoxically, the requirements for compensatory testing when coupled with provisions and State funds for compensatory programs for those students who failed the tests, increased indirectly the vocational options for some academically disadvantaged students. As some States assumed the full cost for compensatory services, LEAs had greater flexibility and opportunities to use the VEA set-aside funds for disadvantaged in combination with the state funds to develop unique vocational programs to serve the academically disadvantaged students. For example, in Duval County, Florida, the opportunities had resulted in the pooling of funds to create alternative programs and special centers for the severely disadvantaged students. In New York City, it had permitted the development of alternative vocational education programs to recruit and service more of the disadvantaged student population, thus increasing the opportunities for such students to participate in vocational education programs.

However, even these new programs in Florida and New York had not resulted in collective planning to meet the needs of the disadvantaged. Hence, though vocational educators in those states had bigger pools of funds for planning purposes, the planning activity was done independently; this arrangement appeared to be satisfactory to both sets of administrators. By indicators such as increased enrollments of disadvantaged students in vocational education programs, for example, the outcomes of these arrangements seemed to have some positive implications for the disadvantaged population.

6. Refinement of the Definition of the "Disadvantaged" Had Not Resulted in Displacement of Any Subset of the Disadvantaged.

The 1976 VEA legislation defined the population for service, using the narrower economic term, rather than the broader socioeconomic one, and eliminating the general phrase "and other handicaps." By adding the criterion that persons "must require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational educational programs," Congress made clear the principle that students who can succeed in the regular vocational educational programs would not be eligible for funding under the minimum percentage for the disadvantaged. Congress' intent was to insure that resources were properly targeted to those students most in need. The results of the analyses of the interview data concerning local definitions of disadvantaged students suggested that those who were considered eligible to receive service included all or any of those students who might have been serviced by the 1968 definition. For example, as cited above in "Definitions," in one instance, race was sufficient for placement in the category of disadvantagement, irrespective of performance on standardized measures or income level. When the director of the vocational education program was asked to explain this inclusion, the response was that in that community "all Negroes tend to be poor." Researchers, in discussions with other respondents and in their own observations and through the review of relevant demographic literature, discovered that though the Black population for the city was small, a sizable proportion could easily be classified economically as "middle-class." For definitional and identification purposes, however, in this LEA, Black children from those families would be classified as "disadvantaged," and, therefore, if desirous of participation in vocational education programs would most likely be placed in "special" programs. This turned out to be the very point of contention between the small Black community and the vocational education program in that school district.

More importantly, however, was the general finding that the definition was, in most cases, irrelevant for purposes of placement in vocational or other programs, since the factors considered were rarely related to those which would "enable them (students) to succeed in vocational education programs." In general, the major factors determining placement were cognitive, i.e., academic achievement on nationally normed tests and, in some cases, state or county competency tests.

Rarely did researchers find local vocational education programs and/or education programs, in general, for the academically disadvantaged with identification and placement procedures that considered other factors related to potential success in vocational education programs. To the contrary, first academic and social competency had to be demonstrated; vocational interests, work related and basic employment skills were secondary for placement into vocational education programs.

One exception was found in Modesto, California, where each high school had a career center where students could seek the help of career counselors and other guidance specialists. More important, however, the career centers operated a structured program required for all students to help them explore their career options, define their career goals and plan their vocational and academic programs. All freshman students were given a general orientation and were required to participate in individualized career exploration activities at the center. By the end of tenth grade, each student had to complete a ten-week career decision-making course which included the administration of a vocational interest and aptitude test. On the basis of the results, each student worked with a counselor to develop a three-year career plan outlining the academic and vocational courses, as well as the work experience programs most appropriate for achieving his or her personal career goals. The plans then became a standard against which the student, the parents and the school counselors could monitor the progress made toward these goals.

7. The Community Colleges Devoted a Significant Amount of Time, Money, and Effort to Compensatory Programs for the Academically Disadvantaged.

The increased size of the disadvantaged population, coupled with the increased enrollment in occupational programs at the community college level had led to greater emphasis on providing remedial services to the academically disadvantaged. Researchers found that community college administrators were spending a considerable amount of time, money, and effort in addressing this set of issues. The community colleges tended to draw disadvantaged adults in numbers greater than the public or private four-year institutions. This increment had presented many challenges to these institutions. However, despite the collective planning efforts and development of experimental and pilot programs designed to provide high quality of services to the disadvantaged, data collected by researchers indicate that: (1) the dropout rates for the disadvantaged population were very high at the community college level, and (2) the participation of the disadvantaged population in the more technical programs was low. Thus, despite what appeared to be herculean efforts on their part, community college administrators noted that many students came with such severe deficiencies that remedial services were not sufficient to provide them with the minimum competencies required for participation in the occupational programs of their choice. As a result, many disadvantaged students became discouraged and dropped out, or changed their majors to less demanding programs.

8. Community-Based and CETA-Sponsored Organizations Whose Major Goals Addressed the Needs of the Economically Disadvantaged Spent at Least One-Half or More of Their Time and Effort in Addressing the Academic Deficiencies of Their Clients.

In attempting to carry out their mandates of providing the economically disadvantaged with the skills and tools needed to gain successful entry into the labor market, CETA-sponsored and other community-based organizations had found that most of their clients were not prepared to begin training because of deficiencies in reading and elementary math concepts. Thus, most CETA-sponsored programs had established remediation programs designed to prepare their clients for job-related training.

At all sites, and at all CETA-sponsored programs visited at these sites, there was a remediation program in operation. In effect, based on observations and review of material regarding costs for services provided both within and across programs, it appeared as if the CETA system were operating a parallel school system for older adolescents and adults, many of whom had been certified as "graduates" by the local public school systems, but who were unable to pass competency tests of basic skills.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

A. LOCAL POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED PERSONS.

1. Policy of LEAs' Was That of "Equal Education Opportunity for All Students."

Researchers were unable to identify any specific policy regarding the delivery of vocational education services to the economically disadvantaged at the local level. Local education agency policy generally addressed the desired outcome of "equal educational opportunity"; but rarely, was that outcome defined in a specific manner. Some policies expressed concern about the "disadvantaged," but they seldom specified or differentiated among the various subgroups of the "disadvantaged."

2. LEA and Procedures Regarding the Economically Disadvantaged Were Guided by State and Federal Legislation.

Researchers were able to identify specific sets of procedures related to the provision of services to the economically disadvantaged. Those procedures, however, were related to guidelines which addressed various provisions of federal and state categorical aid legislation, designed to reduce the degree of economic disadvantagement that existed among school populations. The usual procedures identified were those which provided some form of employment for economically disadvantaged older adolescents, as well as health and nutrition services, through free school lunch programs, for all identified economically disadvantaged children.

3. Federal Manpower Policy Required the Participation of the Vocational Education Community on the Employment and Training Councils in Local Areas; However, There Was Little Evidence of Reciprocity on the Part of the Education Community.

Researchers interviewed, wherever possible, members of local Employment Development and Training Councils who advised the prime sponsors on CETA policy and program development, as well as members of the Local or State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. The councils included the range of interests related to the development of effective manpower policy and programs. To that end, researchers found it was easy to identify those individuals and/or organizations representing the vocational education sector or interests. It was not unusual, especially in smaller urban communities and rural areas, to find the chair of the vocational education department of the local high school or area vocational high school, as well as the chair of the vocational education department of the local community college, as members of the local Employment and Training Council. Conversely, however, researchers rarely found representation from the local Employment and Training Council on the Local Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Most often, representation on the local councils included members from the employment sector (usually the vice-president for personnel of one of the larger firms in the area), the labor sector, and occasionally, the local community college. Seldom, if ever, did researchers find the inclusion of individuals from the local youth employment programs on these councils.

4. Community College Policy Was to Help Economically Disadvantaged Students Achieve Their Goals Through the Provision of a Variety of Financial Assistance Programs.

At the community college level, researchers discovered that the most common practice was that of providing financial assistance to "needy" students. Community college administrators generally agreed that in order to service the community, the colleges must be specific in the types of services provided to the various special needs groups who came to them for an education. The "open door" or "equal educational opportunity" policy at the community college level was most often interpreted to mean that, with regard to the economically disadvantaged, some form of financial assistance was to be made available. To that end, researchers were able to identify a variety of basic entitlement and work study programs that were administered, usually through the Office of Financial Aid at the colleges.

5. The Policy of Community-Based and CETA-Sponsored Organizations Was to Provide Those Employment Skills Which Would Enable the Economically Disadvantaged to Become Economically Self-Sufficient.

Most community-based programs, as well as those that were CETA-sponsored, saw their role as that of providing the employment training and related education that would enable the economically disadvantaged to secure employment. In the case of CETA-sponsored organizations, the policy was stated in the federal and state manpower legislations. Community-based organizations such as the Opportunities Industrialization Corporation, Inc., and others, had as a statement of policy some desire to help the poor help themselves.

B. DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. The Economically Disadvantaged Were Defined by Their Low-Income Status.

In all instances, whether at the LEA, community college, or CETA program, community-based level, the economically disadvantaged were defined by their low-income status. Guidelines for defining "low-income" were usually predicated on legislative guidelines governing state and/or federal employment legislation or state and/or federal categorical aid legislation.

2. At the Local Education Level, Low-Income Status and Other Effects Were Often Confused.

At the local education level, researchers found that while guidelines for definition of the economically disadvantaged existed in state and federal legislation and played a major role in local education agency practices, there was a tendency to lump several subgroups under the label of "disadvantaged." As mentioned in the prior chapter on the "Academically Disadvantaged," the consequence of this overlapping of subcategories was that very often "disadvantaged" students were placed in programs without consideration to their specific needs. Thus, it was not unusual to find in separate vocational programs students who had a variety of disadvantagements (e.g., economic, academic, limited-English proficient, learning disabled or emotionally handicapped) grouped together and receiving the "same" treatment regardless of the specific nature of their condition. This failure to attend to the varieties of conditions affected inner-city minority youth most.

When researchers attempted to probe further on this issue, many respondents, especially local school administrators, indicated that they saw no need to make the differentiation between the two subgroups, since those who were "academically disadvantaged" tended to be "economically disadvantaged" as well. Pursuant to this, researchers asked respondents if there were significant groups of "middle-income" students who might be academic underachievers, and conversely, low-income students who might be academically gifted; and, if so, how might these subgroups be addressed. Respondents, particularly in small and rural districts, stated that the number of students in those categories was generally small and that classroom teachers were responsible for identifying the students and for programming accordingly to accommodate their needs.

On this issue, it should be mentioned that researchers were often informed by community groups, usually representatives of minority communities, that such attention to individual student needs rarely occurred in the local schools, unless parents pressed for this or unless a local school administrator "took a personal interest" in a student. Additionally, members of the local advisory council on vocational education in one of the larger urban areas stated that they had a real concern about the outcome of any state or federal audit of their vocational education programs for the "disadvantaged," because they felt that the identification process was faulty. For example, as one member stated in a very long interview:

> I know for a fact that our programs for the disadvantaged simply look at neighborhoods. The assumption is that since a large number of poor kids live there, all of the kids in the neighborhood are poor. But this is not so. We know that middle-income and poor minority kids live in the same areas, because of housing patterns which are discriminatory. Yet, we do not take this information into account when we plan programs. All of the middle-class minority kids do not attend private schools. We know this, yet we do nothing about it.

3. Procedures for Identification of the Economically Disadvantaged Required Documentation of Income Status.

As with definition of status, researchers found a high degree of consistency across programs regarding identification of status. In all instances, students or persons were required to provide some form of documentation of low-income status. Documents most often required were a recent IRS statement of income, statement of institutionalized status, statement of receipt of public assistance, and/or statements of employment/unemployment status.

This documentation requirement necessitated that the individual identify him/herself for service. Several program administrators indicated that this self-identification documentation requirement resulted in underrepresentation of the eligible population. For example, in Poughkeepsie, New York, Youth Services officials who administered the local CETA Youth Program stated that though they had a good grasp of the eligible population for services, applications to the program, especially for the summer component, tended to be lower than their estimates. In their research efforts, they attempted to discover the reasons for the low participation figures. Responses from individuals indicated that the parents of many of the low-income students felt that the documentation requirement was an invasion of privacy. In other instances, respondents indicated that they did not wish to be identified as "poor," and therefore, did not volunteer for participation.

Other program managers and administrators who dealt with limited-English proficient populations stated that the groups whom they serviced have cultural patterns that did not place emphasis on documents; hence, their programs had difficulty in meeting this administrative requirement. Many of these programs had attempted to develop alternative ways of providing documentation, e.g., the identification of other members of the family who could verify information. However, such alternatives had limited utility, in that they were acceptable to central administrative staffs only under certain conditions, e.g., to establish proof of age and relationship.

In the states of Florida and California, researchers had the opportunity to interview program staff who worked with migrant populations to insure that they had the opportunity for participation in educational and vocational/occupational education programs. In all instances, program eligibility criteria included the CETA income criterion and proof of migrant status; that is, that the student and his or her family had left the state or moved within the state within the last 12 months. In areas where the migrant population was quite extensive, program staff were working assiduously to outreach and service these individuals. However, as in the case of those programs for limited-English proficient populations, staff members indicated that documentation of status posed a problem, since documentation tended to have little value within the culture.

4. The Involvement of Vocational Educators in the Definition, Identification, Placement Process Was Negligible.

In no case did researchers find that vocational educators were involved in establishing procedures related to the definition, identification, and placement of economically disadvantaged students, even in programs under the aegis of vocational educators. Invariably, these procedures were handled by central office or school administrative staffs.

The school person delegated with the responsibility was most likely the guidance counselor. As individual student programs were developed, it was usually the guidance counselor who determined, based on the information about income status, whether or not the individual was eligible for work-study programs operated by the Department of Vocational Education, or if the individual was eligible for other work-study or financial assistance programs, such as the In-School Youth or Summer Youth programs. Once this determination was made, it was then funneled to the appropriate department.

5. Community Colleges Identified the Economically Disadvantaged Through their Participation in State and Federal Financial Assistance Programs.

At the community college level, identification was done in two ways: upon application for admission and after matriculation. In the first instance, individuals were provided with applications for financial assistance as well as application for admissions. Persons were asked to provide information required by law, with appropriate verification. This information was forwarded to the Office of Financial Aid after the applications had been returned to the college. The office reviewed the application, verified the information, and determined the type and quantity of financial assistance that could be provided according to respective legislative guidelines. This information was made available to the students, usually prior to admission, so that they were aware of the level of support the institution could offer to help meet the cost of their education during a given period.

In the latter instance, individuals who had not applied for assistance, or who had transferred to the institution from another, or whose financial status had changed, could make application for financial assistance, after having been admitted to the institution. In these instances, individuals may or may not receive support, depending on the amount available to the institution and the amounts already committed by the institution. Community college financial aid administrators reported that financial assistance could vary from one-third to the overwhelming majority of any entering class of students, depending on the service area.

6. CETA-Sponsored and Community-Based Organizations Defined and Identified the Economically Disadvantaged According to Federal and State Manpower Legislation.

Federal and state manpower legislation defined the service population in terms of income, employment status, and disabling condition. Procedures, however, varied from site to site. Researchers found that there tended to be two sets of processes. In the former, definitional, identificational, and placement processes were centralized; in the latter, decentralized. An example of the former would be that of San Antonio, Texas.

Central administrative staff in San Antonio were concerned about the quality of process for entry. Hence, they developed three service centers in the major sectors of the city. Their function was to intake applications. After an application had been made for service, it was sent to the Texas State Office of Employment Services for verification of eligibility. All eligible clients were then taken to the San Antonio Goodwill Services Center where, over a period of three days, they were given a battery of tests of basic skills, vocational aptitude, and work-related tests. A client profile was developed and returned to the respective service center where a counselor met with the client to develop a work plan. Based on desired employment and other factors, the client was placed in a program with one of the many subcontractors for employment training and other educational services.

According to San Antonio CETA officials, this process allowed for quality control as well as careful screening. Such attention enabled the overall program to reduce its dropout rate significantly. It also allowed the central administration to focus on costs for subsets of services. For example, as a result of this process, it was determined that the quality of the basic skills services delivery across subcontractors was uneven. The plan of the central administration now was to centralize ABE services delivery under one contract with the Control Data Corporation, in stage one, and to centralize all GED services delivery, either under the same contract with Control Data or with another contractor, in subsequent stages.

In some of the other sites, the entire set of processes were decentralized. In this instance, an individual presented him or herself to a CETA-contracted organization where he or she applied for service. The contractor then forwarded the application to the state employment service or job service for verification of eligibility status. Once verified, the individual was given a set of screenings along the dimensions of basic skills proficiency, vocational aptitude, and any other relevant set of factors. In most instances, researchers found that a combination of standardized measures and program-developed instruments were used. The results were then evaluated by the organization's counseling staff, and, after discussions with the applicant, the individual was placed in training when an opening occurred. Under this set of procedures, central administrative staffs had difficulty in determining the quality of services provided until such time as reviews of organizational applications for refunding were undertaken. Such procedures usually resulted in the burden of proof being placed on the contractor to meet the basic requirement of percentage of successful completions and placements in the area for which the client had been trained.

Researchers also were able to identify nontraditional arrangements for the delivery of services. These "nontraditional" arrangements involved linkages with differing institutions to provide services to the client and to insure quality of service. For example, in Fort Pierce, Florida, the Balance of State prime sponsor contracted with the local community college, Indian River Community College, to administer all Title II B, C and D CETA programs, as well as Title IV in-school youth employment programs. Under this contract, the community college processed applications, determined eligibility according to state and federal manpower legislative guidelines, assessed individual needs regarding basic skills competency, occupational/vocational aptitude and interests, and provided the necessary training and counseling for all CETA programs.

In Holtville, California, the Imperial County Work Training Center was contracted to undertake the assessment of basic skills, vocational aptitude and vocational interests for all CETA clients, prior to their referral to the appropriate community-based organization. In addition, in Holtville, the CETA prime sponsor had contracted with the local community college, Imperial Valley College, to provide separate occupational programs for CETA clients. While this in itself was not unusual in that similar arrangements tended to be prevalent in rural areas and in small urban centers, what was unique was that the college in turn collaborated with a local community-based organization, Camposinos Unidos, to administer an Office Skills Center Program in satellite locations in remote areas of the county for economically disadvantaged women. Although the courses were open to everyone, most based organization, Camposinos Unidos, to administer an Office Skills Center Program in satellite locations in remote areas of the county for economically disadvantaged women. Although the courses were open to everyone, most were and had been CETA eligible, female migrant workers.

In Oakland, California, the Peralta Community College district was awarded the CETA contract to determine eligibility of all CETA clients as well as to make referrals, subsequent to the screening process, to the variety of community-based organizations in the area. Similarly, the Modesto Junior College was contracted by the prime sponsor to undertake, through its CETA-sponsored skills center, a variety of activities to upgrade the skills of unskilled participants so that they could qualify for entry into the labor market. The client group serviced included economically disadvantaged ethnic minorities, refugees, welfare recipients, offenders, and women. For female clients, every attempt was made to train and place them in nontraditional programs and jobs when the client expressed such desire.

C. PLANNING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

1. Planning Activities Related to Programs for the Economically Disadvantaged Were Usually Under the Direction of Central Office Staff or Guidance Staff at the School Building Level.

Vocational educators were rarely involved in program planning activities related to the economically disadvantaged. Rather, at the local education level, programs were usually under the direction of key administrative staff at central headquarters; at the school building level, such activities were generally under the direction of the guidance department personnel.

Researchers discovered that planning activities related to the economically disadvantaged seldom focused on academic or vocational program placement. Instead, these activities usually related to documentational requirements for participation in categorical aid programs. The tendency was to address the economic needs of those who could be identified as economically disadvantaged in terms of eligibility for CETA in-school or out-of-school youth programs. There seemed to be little concern for the educational development of the student in terms of the effects of economic disadvantagement on the ability and motivation of the student to develop educationally to his or her fullest potential.

2. The Major School-Based Activities for the Economically Disadvantaged Were Those Related to Health and Nutrition and Youth Employment.

Interviews with LEA central office personnel and school building personnel who worked with economically disadvantaged youth revealed a high degree of consensus about the scope of program activities related to this subgroup of the school population. By definition the economically disadvantaged were poor; hence, program directions focused on providing first, for the health and nutrition needs of the students and second, the opportunity for the youth to secure employment in order that they might develop some degree of economic self-sufficiency. Free school lunch was provided for students in Grades K through 12, while youth employment was provided for high school students in Grades 10 through 12.

In every school district researchers visited, there was present a free school lunch program. Building administrators in the inner city urban schools stated that participation in these programs usually exceeded one-half of the total school population. Youth employment programs, however, were more limited in scope and were administered in a variety of ways. Seldom, however, did researchers find that the youth employment programs had sufficient numbers of slots to accommodate the number of students who were eligible, or who desired to participate in these programs.

For example, in all school districts, the district participated in the Youth Employment and Training program funded by CETA funds; however, some school districts participated as one of several contractors which administered the program to a limited number of students. One of the most unique patterns was that found in Modesto, California where the Modesto City Schools were contracted by the prime sponsor, the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors, to administer all of the youth employment and training program for the county. Under this arrangement, the Modesto public schools established basic operational procedures related to the provision of key services such as vocational guidance and counseling, administration of vocational guidance aptitude and skill batteries, orientation to the world of work and identification of organizations and other agencies that could serve as work sites for participating youth.

3. Vocational Educators Were Involved Primarily in Those Work Experience Programs That Related to the Specific Vocational Program Offering.

Because of interest on the part of society in the employability of youth, a variety of work experience could be identified in most urban areas.

However, the objectives of these programs varied. As stated above, youth employment programs funded by CETA legislation had as their objective the provision of employment so that low-income students could develop a degree of economic self-sufficiency. Some of the programs provided extensive training and preparation for employment; others, however, did not. Vocational educators were rarely involved in these programs; they were usually directed by other administrative personnel and were at times, subcontracted to community based groups for administration or for provision of work sites.

Vocational education programs, however, did have their own work experience programs which provide occupational preparation through a cooperative arrangement between the school and employer for entry into specific occupations. The purposes of these programs were to assist students in developing and refining those occupational competencies necessary to acquire employment, to adjust to the employment environment, and to advance in the occupation of their choice through a combination of related instruction and employment experiences. Low-income students participated in these programs to the degree that they participated in vocational education programs; that is, by choice and by having met the admission and program completion requirements. They did not participate by virtue of their low-income status.

In most cases, vocational educators were intimately involved in these programs. They played the major role of identification of the specific work site; they often determined which students would participate in the program (that is, by evaluating the degree of readiness of the student for participation); they served as the link, very often, between the school and the employment community. While large urban school systems often had individuals who functioned as work site developers and coordinators, supervising students on-site, in small urban centers and in rural counties, researchers discovered that vocational educators played the critical roles in the development and operation of the vocational work experience program. The vocational work experience program was critical to the career of the participating students since it allowed them to demonstrate their ability and aptitude; additionally, as often was related to the research teams, the most able students, as a result of participation in the vocational work experience programs, were able to secure commitments for full-time employment upon graduation and/or successful completion of the vocational education programs.

4. Although LEA Representatives Often Participated in the Planning for CETA-Sponsored Youth and Adult Programs, Rarely Were CETA Representatives Involved in the Planning of Vocational Education Programs.

Representatives from many LEAs and most community colleges participated in the planning functions of CETA, particularly in the youth councils. With regard to the LEAs, in the smaller communities the representative was most often the vocational education director while in the larger cities, the person involved was either the administrator of the district's work experience and CETA youth work programs or, as was the case in Oakland, the director of school/community relations. In some districts, there was a close relationship between these individuals and the vocational staff. More often, however, there appeared to be very little contact between administrators within the LEAs. The situation differed with respect to the community colleges. In most cases, the individuals serving on the CETA planning councils were the deans of occupational education who were the primary persons responsible for the planning of the college's vocational and occupational programs.

While school and college representatives affiliated with vocational education, directly or indirectly, participated to some extent in the planning of CETA programs, particularly YETP programs for services to in-school youth, the involvement of CETA in the planning of school vocational education programs was very limited. Rarely were the CETA prime sponsors or representatives from CETA funded organizations among the members of the local advisory councils for vocational education. The only exceptions found by researchers were in three separate sites in California, two of which involved the vocational councils at the community college level.

Other instances of cooperative planning efforts between CETA and either the LEAs or the community colleges were most often related to advisory councils tied to specific CETA-funded projects such as skills centers (e.g., the community colleges in Jacksonville, Florida, Quincy and Chicago, Illinois, and Modesto, California) or special arrangements with the BOCES in New York State. Ultimately, however, in such cases, CETA involvement was limited since representation did not involve participation in the general vocational education councils, the groups that were generally responsible for review and approval of the districts' VEA applications prior to submission to the State.

5. At the Community College Level, the Financial Aid Officer Played the Major Role in Assisting Economically Disadvantaged Students.

At the community college level, the major planning activity focused on the provision of financial assistance to the students, so that they could pursue the program of their choice. Placement in programs was not related to financial status; placement was according to academic performance and choice. For those who were low-income, however, the key person was the financial aid officer, who evaluated the applications for financial aid, and determined, according to the various guidelines, the amount of support low-income students could expect to receive.

At all of the community colleges visited by researchers, there was active involvement in the variety of state and federal categorical aid and entitlement programs for all classifications of groups who had been designated as targets for financial assistance. Additionally, many had other resources upon which to rely, such as a variety of college scholarships, college loan funds, alumni scholarships and local philanthropic and other civic and special interest organizations.

6. At the CETA Program Level, Planning Occurred at Two Levels: Central Administrative Headquarters, and Among Program Staff at the Various Contract Organizations.

Though CETA programs had as their outcomes the enhancing of the capability of low-income, disadvantaged populations to gain economic self-sufficiency, the nature of the planning activity varied at different levels. At the central administrative level, primary focus was on insuring that the federal and state manpower guidelines regarding equal participation of the various subgroups of the low-income population were met and that there was adequate representation among the participating population. At the individual contractor level, planning activities related to the quality of the services delivered to the CETA eligible clients.

Regarding the former set of activities, researchers discovered that subcontractors and other community-based organizations expressed concern about the guidelines that governed participation of the various subgroups of the low-income population. For example, in the Southwestern part of the United States, advocacy groups for Mexican Americans were concerned that Hispanic women were not represented among the client populations to any degree proportional to their participation in the larger community or in the labor market. In San Antonio, Texas, the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund and the National Organization of Women jointly sued the San Antonio CETA over this issue of representation. The prime sponsor reached an out-of-court settlement with these two organizations and issued a revision of its guidelines concerning participation rates to insure that the goal of "equal" representation would be reached.

Regarding the latter set of activities, program staff most often complained of the difficulty in undertaking successful planning activities when budget and outreach/participation issues were uncertain. Most community-based organizations that contracted with CETA complained that information about reauthorization and level of budget was received too late in the program year to make a significant difference in the ability of the contractor to undertake the scope of work. Additionally, many complained of the lack of "linkage" among the various subcontractors. As an example, several subcontractors, who provided training and employment services to women primarily, noted the absence of joint planning or the opportunity for such planning to insure that general women's problems were being addressed across programs. One of the major issues concerned inter-program transfers of clients. The lack of "linkage" mechanisms acted as a disincentive for referral of clients to other programs when appropriate services could not be provided. The competition for clients among subcontractors was very high since budget allocations were based on numbers of clients served.

D. STRATEGIES FOR SERVING THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. At the LEA Level, Attention Was Focused on the "Academically Disadvantaged" Rather Than the Economically Disadvantaged.

Researchers found that most VEA set-aside funds were used to address the needs of the "academically disadvantaged"; this was consistent with the policy of most local education agencies of targeting proficiency in the basic skills as the priority for the local schools. Seldom did researchers find specific programs or projects that focused on the economically disadvantaged. The exception was the State of Florida.

In Florida, work-study programs for the economically disadvantaged were supported by a match of state vocational education and local education funds. At the local school district level, high schools contributed a percentage of their budgets as a requisite for participation. Through this program, found throughout the state, economically-needy students were placed in job slots in the high schools. Most of the slots were those of clerical or maintenance/custodial helper. The number of slots available was usually limited. For example, during the 1979-80 school year in Duval County, only 60 slots were available for the entire school district.

Consideration was being given to expanding the program to include part-time employment after school and full-time summer positions. At the same time, however, principals in participating high schools were becoming increasingly resistant to the matching requirement, and the expectation communicated to the research team was that many schools may drop out of the program because of the local matching requirements.

2. The Basic Strategy for Addressing the Needs of the Economically Disadvantaged at the High School Level Was Study-Work, Often CETA-Funded.

In most of the fifteen sites visited in the conduct of the study, researchers found CETA-supported work experience programs that provided part-time employment during the school year and full-time employment during the summer for economically disadvantaged students. The quality of the programs and the number of students participating varied. Administration of the programs differed as well. Sometimes, the school system was the subcontractor for the entire program, as in the case of the YETP program in Stannislaus County, California, which contracted with Modesto City Public Schools to administer the YETP program.

The following objectives of the youth employment program were consistent at all sites.

- providing gainful employment and other benefits;
- increasing the potential of employability of youth through meaningful work experience and academic training;
- providing additional income for youth from low-income families;
- providing incentives for enrollees to complete their high school training to improve their academic achievement; and
- assisting disadvantaged youth in developing responsible attitudes and in overcoming problems of social adjustment by providing an opportunity for disadvantaged youth to earn school credit through participation in the youth work program.

Researchers found the quality of the programs to be mixed, however. Some, as in the case of Poughkeepsie, New York, paid careful attention to the quality of the career/vocational component to insure that the work experience was "meaningful," and to insure that students received some formal guidance activities. Others did not formally address the educational aspect of the work-experience program, leaving many work-related issues to be addressed in less formal ways.

Recruitment and service delivery also differed. In some instances, the schools were the places where recruitment for programs was initiated, but administration of the programs occurred at another site. In others, recruitment and administration was handled by school personnel, but payroll and financial matters were handled elsewhere, either at the school district's central office, or at the prime sponsor's headquarters.

In larger systems, there tended to be cumbersome procedures related to both recruitment and administration of programs. For example, in New York City, it was not uncommon to find several people at the same school site involved in recruitment, placement, and other services delivery related to the youth employment programs. Often, these individuals were located in different bureaus. Though involved in similar tasks, the tasks were uncoordinated. Often the personnel addressed different subsets of the school population; some focused on those students interested primarily in business-oriented positions, others focused on those interested in specialized vocational positions.

School administrators at all sites, irrespective of size, locale, and ethnic/racial composition felt that these programs were critical as motivators for the low-income students at their schools. Most admitted, however, that the number of slots seldom was sufficient to meet the demand, and expressed concern about those students unable to secure some form of employment, especially if they were both poor and academically disadvantaged.

3. There Were No Special Academic or Vocational Programs for the Economically Disadvantaged Population.

Unlike the "academically disadvantaged" population, the research did not uncover any programs, vocational or academic that addressed low-income students solely. Participation in vocational or academic that addressed low-income students solely. Participation in vocational programs was based on choice and ability of students to meet the entry requirements, where they existed. Participation in academic programs was based on school policies regarding required subjects and electives. Special classes were developed primarily for the academically disadvantaged, consistent with the prevelant local school policy of developing competency in basic skills and providing remedial services when such competencies were lacking.

Work study programs supported by CETA and those cited above in the State of Florida were the only strategies for providing economic support and work experience for low-income students. These were unrelated to the vocational work-experience programs, sometimes called cooperative programs, which were often administered and operated by the vocational education departments in local schools. While many of the operations of the vocational work-experience may be similar to the CETA-funded youth employment programs, the objectives differed. Vocational work experience programs provided occupational preparation through a cooperative arrangement between the school and employer for entry into a specific occupation. In some instances, the number of hours of classroom instruction and work-experience were required by law. The objectives of these vocational programs were to assist students in developing and refining those occupational competencies necessary to acquire employment, to adjust to the employment environment, and to advance in the occupation of one's choice through a combination of related instruction and employment experiences. Vocational work experience programs, therefore, were integral to vocational programs and economically disadvantaged students participated to the degree that they were enrolled in those programs, not to the degree that they were identified as economically disadvantaged, the essential criterion for the CETA funded work-experience programs.

4. At the Community Colleges, the Basic Strategy Was to Provide Financial Assistance for Low-Income Students.

Pursuant to their espoused philosophy of "equal educational opportunity," researchers were informed by community college administrators that the basic strategy employed in attending to the needs of low-income students was to provide financial assistance. This assistance took many forms and was determined according to individual financial need.

Procedures for determination of need and for providing services were fairly consistent at all community colleges. The responsibility for financial need determination and service was vested in the college's Finanical

Aid Office. This office received applications for assistance, and applied criteria of the various state, federal, and local finanical aid programs to determine level of eligibility. Criteria for eligibility generally related to income level. For those students who were severely economically disadvantaged, there were varieties of entitlement programs as well as loans and work study programs. Financial Aid Offices attempted to provide as much support as possible, by packaging the various programs which would enable the student to meet the cost of tuitions, books, fees, and living expenses, where applicable. Vocational education was tapped to support work-study programs. Financial aid officers in community colleges in areas which service both rural, isolated areas and urban, inner city areas stated that their major problem was one of finding sufficient financial aid to support the needs of the increasing numbers of students who sought higher education and who were in need of finanical aid.

Researchers found that the community colleges played a major role in services delivery regarding the economically disadvantaged. As stated above in preceding sections, the community colleges had become involved in many aspects of CETA services delivery. In every state visited during the study, there were samples of the community colleges providing specific services to CETA-eligible clients. Specifically in the states of Florida and California community colleges were intimately involved in CETA operations, sometimes having been contracted to provide basic assessment, outreach services and skills training.

In places such as Poughkeepsie, New York, Quincy, Illinois, and Fort Pierce, Florida, the community colleges developed special program offerings to meet the needs of the CETA-eligible clients. The tuition and other education-related costs were paid by CETA. As Dutchess Community College in Poughkeepsie, New York, CETA, the local BOCES, and the community college entered into a novel arrangement, whereby CETA eligible clients would be trained for the first or basic level in plant maintenance by the BOCES staff, and for the intermediate level by the community college staff. All courses, however, were accredited by the community college.

Respondents engaged in these novel arrangements indicated, however, that such arrangements are not without their problems. For example, though the linkage activities facilitated service delivery for the client, they created and raised problems for the respective institutions regarding respective responsibilities and expertise. In the instance of Poughkeepsie, some respondents who where involved in negotiations indicated that they had some concerns about where the lines of authority began and ended and, the degree to which the activities of one institution might become subsumed or assumed by the other.

Other problems raised in interviews were those related to "separate" programming. Several members of community college program staffs felt that the insistence on separate programs for CETA clients was not only dysfunctional, but reinforced negative images about the clients among other staff and students. For example, at one community college in a small city, the Director of Counseling indicated that the prime sponsor insisted on separate classes for CETA clients so as to be sure that the costs for services could be accounted for by the college. The director indicated that there was an appropriate accounting mechanism in place and that the college serviced other "special" students such as the handicapped, and that there had been no problem with other public agencies. However, she stated CETA staff were insistent on the separate classes. She indicated further that since some students and staff had a negative image of CETA as "welfare," she felt that more could be done to reduce stereotyping if the students were in classes with other students. The logic of her argument was not accepted by CETA administratrs, however, and the separate programs were continued.

5. CETA-Funded Organizations Provided Employment and Training Leading to Gainful Employment for Economically Disadvantaged Populations.

As mentioned above, CETA-funded employment programs attempted to provide gainful employment for school-aged youth, as well as economically disadvantaged adults, so that they may become self-sufficient. In attempting to meet this objective, CETA-funded programs were faced with several obstacles inhibiting their ability to be successful.

The first of these obstacles was the high incidence of academic and economic disadvantagement. Many CETA-funded program directors shared the concern about their organization's inability to show a high proportion of "successful completers" for training programs because so much attention had been focused on developing competency in basic skills. Even when CETA-eligible clients indicated that they had received a high school diploma, program administrators stated that their screening procedures showed many who lacked the necessary basic skills required for success in the training programs. To compensate for their deficiencies, most programs developed basic skills training components to prepare clients for entry into the vocational training programs. However, many clients could not complete both the basic skills training and the vocational training programs within the time allocation, and, hence, could not successfully complete the program.

Program managers stated that the prime sponsors were not willing to consider this problem, and the organizations were forced to make hard choices: continue to service the client who might not complete the program but who might have his or her basic skills upgraded; or, refuse to accept the severely academically disadvantaged in order to demonstrate success in percentages of completions. Many program administrators stated that they were opting for the latter choice in order to remain subcontractors. However, they also indicated that they felt that CETA legislation needed to be revised to attend to this problem, which they felt was getting progressively worse.

Another problem shared by CETA-funded program managers with researchers concerned placement. Many organizations stated they they had difficulty in finding jobs for their successful completers in the areas for which they were trained. The pressures in the economy, in their opinion, had resulted in their clients competing with academically-able individuals, many of whom had advanced degrees, for increasingly limited numbers of slots. This was discouraging both for program staff as well as for clients. Some placement staffers in CBO's stated that many employers in the private sector were unwilling to hire CETA trained individuals. Some employers stated that the skill level of the population was too low. For others, as one placement staff person stated, "It's simply racism. CETA means welfare, and welfare means minorities."

There appeared to be some reluctance on the part of employers to link with the CETA programs. This was particularly the case in rural areas and small towns throughout the county. Manpower planning specialists and job specialists in a rural Southwestern county indicated that the major problem they had in establishing job training programs in the area was the refusal on the part of the local city council and the school board to allow CETA programs to use/share their buildings or vocational classrooms to train local CETA-eligible clients. According to staff, the work ethic was very strong in the area and the perception was that those who were poor simply were unwilling to work. The conclusion, therefore, was that the society (town) should not support a welfare recipient since the opportunity to work did exist and, to support the individual was to provide double support.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

1. The VEA Set-Aside for the "Disadvantaged" Was Most Often Used to Support Vocational Education Programs for the "Academically" Disadvantaged Population.

Researchers discovered that the VEA set-aside for the "disadvantaged" was most often used to target services for the "academically" disadvantaged, some of whom may or may not be economically disadvantaged. This attention to the "academically" disadvantaged seemed attributable to two factors. First, most local school policies identified the development of literacy skills as their primary goal for public school students. Hence, programs were designed, planned, and operated to insure that these policies were addressed in all ways possible. Second, the staffs having the major responsibility for the design, planning, and operations of these programs tended to be those in central administrations oriented toward academic not vocational education concerns. As stated earlier in the "Academically Disadvantaged" section, vocational educators were rarely involved in the planning and operation of programs for the "disadvantaged" populations.

Researchers could identify only one set of programs which made use of VEA set-aside funds to focus on the economically disadvantaged; those programs existed in Florida and were supported with a combination of state, local, and federal funds. Most often, the VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged were used to support or provide remedial services which would reinforce basic skills development as preparation for vocational education program participation, or in a few cases, to supplement training in vocational education programs, when students were having difficulty in keeping up with their more advantaged classmates.

In some of the larger school districts, funds were combined to develop innovative programs to make vocational education programs more widely available to "disadvantaged" students. This was the case in New York City; however, even in this instance, the primary criterion for service was that of "academic," not "economic" disadvantagement.

It should be noted, however, that when researchers probed for more information about the categories of students who were serviced in these separate or special programs, school administrators often stated that, though they did not have data regarding the participation rates of the economically disadvanaged. because so many of the "academically" disadvantaged were also economically disadvantaged, the school system was living up to its obligation to service both groups of students. Moreover, the focus on basic skills remediation, whether related to success in academic or vocational program pursuits, was seen as consistent with local education policy which held the development of competency in basic skills as the priority for the local education system.

2. The "Excess Cost" Provision of VEA Legislation Was not Well Understood by Local Administrators.

In general, school administrators seemed unwilling to discuss the "excess cost" provision of the VEA legislation. Those who did venture a response usually held differing opinions about the definition of the term and the manner in which it could be and was being applied. In school districts where a disproportionately large share of the student population was "disadvantaged" (usually denoted as both academically and economically), administrators indicated that the "excess cost" rule was not applicable, because the "disadvantaged" were the majority; hence, instruction was provided to service this new "majority." In small urban and rural school districts, the response was that instruction was individualized to handle the problems of this very small group of students, and the paperwork required did not justify the small amount of money that would be received; hence, often the school district did not address this issue at all.

In some districts, as in the case of those in Texas, administrators indicated that the state department had handled excess cost and matching provisions for years and that school districts were only now just beginning to administer this aspect of the grant themselves. Hence, they argued they did not have relevant data to respond to the query adequately.

Most administrators, however, indicated that they were not concerned about whether the legislative intent had been met. Most felt that it had and that, given acceptance of their plans by the state department of education, there was no need for concern. The conclusion drawn by researchers based on the evidence regarding programs which could be identified is that seldom, if ever, are "excess costs" claimed for the provision of services for the economically disadvantaged.

3. VEA Funds Tended to be Programmed According to the Manner in Which They Were Budgeted.

There was considerable evidence to support the claim that VEA funds tended to be programmed according to the manner in which they were budgeted. VEA programs were generally of three types: "regular," "separate," and "special." In the first instance, students elected to participate in a "regular" vocational program, where there was a prescribed curriculum and a certain number of classroom hours to be fulfilled as a condition of certification. The assumption to be made was that the student had both the academic skills and the interest necessary to attain success in the vocation of his or her choice, when accepted into the program.

"Separate" programs were those programs established by the local education agency to provide vocational education instruction, but for students who would have difficulty in meeting the "regular" requirements. For example, in Duval County (Jacksonville, Florida), "separate" vocational education programs had been established to provide instruction to students who did not meet the norm in academic subjects, especially in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics, but who had an interest to participate in vocational education. Instructional offerings were arrayed in ways that were different from the regular program, though there were many similar elements, such as the coopertive or work-study arrangements.

"Special" programs were those which addressed unique subpopulations or unique curricula and were usually short-termed. In Poughkeepsie, New York, for example, the Career Intern Program, sponsored by the Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc., was testing a national model for the delivery of both career/vocational and academic instruction to "potential dropouts." The program focused heavily on small group instruction, one-to-one counseling services, and a strong career/vocational stand allowing students to spend considerable time at work sites throughout their high school careers.

Where such programs were established, funding was usually provided through sources other than VEA (e.g., CETA in Poughkeepsie). However, where the populations were lumped together, as in the case of the use of VEA set-aside for the "disadvantaged," orientation and development tended to focus on the needs of the "academically" disadvantaged. The needs of "economically" disadvantaged were addressed only to the degree that they may also be "academically" disadvantaged.

4. Community Colleges Made Extensive Use of an Array of Federal, State, Local, Public, and Private Resources to Provide Some Form of Financial Assistance to Economically Needy Students.

Because of the commitment to provide equal educational opportunity and the desire to demonstrate responsiveness to local community needs, researchers found that most community colleges tapped a vast array of resources to provide assistance to economically needy students. Most financial aid officers who were interviewed provided researchers with a long list of grants and entitlements from all levels of government. Additionally, many of the colleges could also rely on private philanthropic sources to supplement those from public sources. Many of these included special loan funds (usually short-term) for emergency purposes, special scholarships, and the like. For example, in Poughkeepsie, New York, a local philanthropy provided scholarship assistance to pay the cost of tuition, transportation, and books for OIC clients who were continuing their education at the local community college. The linkage with the college was facilitated by the development of special courses to provide a program articulating with that taught at the Hudson Valley OIC. The community colleges, therefore, having greater institutional flexibility than the local school districts, often were able to tap and were more aggressive in tapping nontraditional financial sources in order to fulfill their mission.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS/SERVICES ON THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.

1. The Impact of the VEA Set-Aside on the Economically Disadvantaged Was Minimal.

Local education policy focused primarily on the development of literary skills including reading, writing and computation. Local school systems therefore were concerned with the ability of all students, especially the disadvantaged, to demonstrate acceptable levels of performance in these skills. Additionally, for most school districts, the amount of the set-aside allocation for the district was very small, necessitating that the district use funds in the ways which it deemed to provide the greatest impact. Since the staff involved in the planning of most of the programs was not composed of vocational educators, but usually central office staff, set-aside funds tended to be used to support separate or special programs for the "academically" disadvantaged. "Economically" disadvantaged students participated to the extent that they were also academically disadvantaged.

Researchers were unable to identify programs supported with VEA set-aside funds for the economically disadvantaged in any site other than those in the State of Florida. Here, the funds were combined with state and local funds to provide work-study programs for economically disadvantaged students. However, in this case, there was a possibility that the program would be reduced in scope since local school administrators had to contribute a proportionate share of their budgets in order to participate, and increasingly, many were becoming reluctant to live up to that requirement.

2. Planning Activities for the Economically Disadvantaged Focused on Nutrition and Youth Employment.

The rule which tended to govern planning activities for the economically disadvantaged was that the poor need work and food. Hence, attention was devoted to nutrition programs and youth employment. Free school lunch was provided through Grades K through 12, and work-study was provided in the high schools between Grades 10 and 12. Attention was given to academic and vocational development only to the extent that the economically disadvantged student was part of another subgroup of students. For example, if also academically disadvantaged the student participated in compensatory education programs that provided basic skills reinforcement. If the student had no academic deficiency, however, then he or she participated in the required and/or regular courses of his or her choice.

In each instance, however, there was no comprehensive planning activity addressing complementary educational strategies for the development and growth of the economically disadvantaged population. Planning was most often fragmented; the major role was played by central administrative staff who insured that this subgroup received the services supported by categorical aid legislation. Another group of central office staff addressed other programs, e.g., nutrition. But there was no central office or office within departments such as vocational education, which looked at the array of categorical, academic and vocational education programs as they impinged on the development of the economically disadvantaged grouping of students.

3. Strategies for Servicing the Economically Disadvantaged Were Limited.

As stated above, planning activities for the economically disadvantaged focused on the provision of nutritional services and youth employment. With rare exception, as in the case of the State of Florida, little or no attention was given to the development of strategies targeted to this group primarily.

Funding tended to follow the programs. Where programs addressed particular populations, so did the funding. Hence, in vocational education, funding followed the pattern of "regular," "separate" or "special" programs. The economically disadvantaged were serviced to the degree that they were included within any of these subgroupings; they were not serviced as a separate or special group. "Separate" programs tended to be funded with "disadvantaged" funds, but the focus was on the development of both "academic" and vocational skills. "Special" programs tended to be pilot programs applying new curricula or addressing the needs of students with "social" behavioral problems; e.g., "dropouts" or "potential dropouts."

4. Community Colleges Had Developed an Array of Strategies For Servicing the Economically Disadvantaged.

Because of institutional flexibility, community colleges had developed an array of strategies for servicing the economically disadvantaged. The prevalent strategy was financial assistance. The community college utilized a variety of public, private, and institutional sources to provide a wide array of financial supportive systems for the economically disadvantaged, which allowed them to pay for their education.

Another strategy employed was that of direct services delivery. Increasingly, the community colleges were becoming contractors and subcontractors to prime sponsors to provide services to the CETA client group. These services ran the gamut from outreach and needs assessment to the development of special programs and courses to help CETA clients gain the skills necessary for seeking and finding gainful employment.

Many of the colleges operated skill training centers used not only by their own students, but by the CETA clients to develop the necessary occupational and vocational skills necessary to acquire employment skills. Others provided intensive occupational and vocational guidance as complements to the "hands-on" training. Such programs enabled the larger group of

CETA clients to develop themselves, while at the same time, addressing subgroups of CETA clients with special needs, such as women, the handicapped, refugees and limited-English proficient populations, and offenders.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE HANDICAPPED

A. LOCAL POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS.

1. Public LEAs Rarely Initiated Policy.

From a reading of the responses to the open-ended question, "Has the school board initiated or adopted a specific policy with regard to vocational education services for handicapped students?", one is struck by the singularity of responses across sites. Despite the fact that school boards are responsible for the formulation of policies, in no case did researchers find in writing a clear policy statement or board directive that considered the special vocational education needs of handicapped students. In fact, it appeared that vocational education programs, in general, were less a priority than the need to raise academic standards for all students, the advantaged as well as those with special needs. Furthermore, board policies tended to be sufficiently broad to allow considerable flexibility in terms of alternatives for planning and implementation of academic as well as career and vocational programs.

2. LEAs' Policies and Procedures Were Guided by State and Federal Mandates.

Although board policies did not differentiate among the various special needs populations, the investigators found several cases, especially in large urban systems, where specific guidelines and procedures for identifying and serving handicapped students were approved officially. In such instances, the specific procedures were guided by state and federal policies, especially those mandated through the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142. Typically, the procedures emphasized three separate provisions that guided the placement of handicapped students into all programs: (1) the identification and screening of handicapped students, (2) the writing of individualized education plans (IEPs), and (3) where possible, the placement of handicapped students in the "least restrictive environment." As indicated, rarely did the procedures specifically mention the placement of handicapped students in vocational education programs. The only exception was in the case of a regional vocational center in a rural area that provided both occupational training and special education services to students from surrounding public LEAs in the county. In this case, the procedures approved by the educational agency specified the requirements for placing handicapped students enrolled in the special education division to programs in its occupational training division.

3. Evidence of Support for Vocational Programs for Handicapped.

The fact that there were no local policies related specifically to vocational education for handicapped students did not mean, according to most respondents, that school boards were not sensitive to the special needs of handicapped students in the schools. As evidence of support for vocational programs for handicapped students, respondents pointed to boards' formal approval of special needs projects designed to increase handicapped students' access to vocational education programs, and also to improve their chances of succeeding. On the other hand, it often appeared that school board approval was nothing more than a formality required as a preliminary step prior to submitting to the state the VEA proposals for funding.

4. Effects of Board's Reactive Policies.

The generally passive and reactive stance assumed by the school boards on the issue of vocational education for handicapped students had allowed school administrators, in particular principals and guidance counselors, to play a key role in determining the nature and quality of vocational opportunities available to these students. Because principals and other school staff operated independently, the vocational opportunities for handicapped students tended to vary significantly from school to school, depending on principals' concerns and priorities. In some cases, where the principals and their staff were sensitive to the needs of handicapped students, programs were effective and students had access to both regular and special vocational programs. In other instances, however, special education services and even vocational education programs were low on the principals' list of priorities and, therefore, the opportunities for the handicapped were substantially less.

The lack of specific goal statements at the local level may be viewed both positively and negatively. For example, in one urban district, a creative special educator, working with a few interested principals and vocational administrators, was able to initiate an innovative vocational evaluation project to facilitate the placement of handicapped students in appropriate occupational programs. On the other hand, a complex set of procedures detailing the requirements to be followed for referral of handicapped students to vocational programs acted as a barrier limiting students' access to such programs in one rural community. In this case, the procedures were so cumbersome as to discourage attempts to place the handicapped students in occupational programs.

While some respondents discounted the relative importance of specific local policies concerning vocational education for the handicapped, more than a few argued that a more active position by the local boards would increase the school staff awareness of their responsibilities toward handicapped students and would increase the students' opportunities for vocational/occupational training.

5. Community College Efforts Were Guided by the Need to Serve the Total Community.

In general, vocational education opportunities for handicapped students at the post-secondary level were guided by the typical community college philosophy and goals of providing appropriate educational services to meet the post-secondary education needs of all students in the district. In spite of the lack of specific policies regarding services to handicapped students, it appeared that administrators, as well as board members, accepted their "community" responsibility seriously and welcomed their mandate to serve special needs groups, including the handicapped.

The community colleges' commitment to serve the vocational needs of handicapped students was demonstrated typically by (1) the creation of separate college units to provide counseling and support services to handicapped students, (2) the removal of structural barriers limiting handicapped students' access to college programs and facilities and (3) the support of outreach activities to increase the enrollment of handicapped students. Furthermore, because community colleges had considerable flexibility in the way they could provide services, there were many opportunities for establishing cooperative relationships and financial agreements with other community agencies serving the handicapped, including Vocational Rehabilitation, the CETA office and, in a few instances, trade unions and private employers.

6. Community-based Organizations and Advocacy Groups Rarely Influenced School District Policy Directly.

In general, community-based organizations providing education and occupational training to adult handicapped persons in the community were rarely involved in the development of school districts' polices or in the administrative decision-making process. In only two of the fifteen communities visited were representatives from such organizations participants in the local Advisory Councils for Vocational Education (LACVE). Yet in all of the communities, such organizations existed and the schools, according to state and federal guidelines, had established LACVEs.

With regard to advocacy groups, such as the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities or the Center for Independent Living in California, school representatives generally viewed their relationship with such groups as adversarial. Advocacy groups did not provide direct services to handicapped students, but at the request of parents, could act on their behalf vis-a-vis school officials. Depending on the particular situation, the nature and extent of the involvement differed from participation at a "staffing" meeting to review and determine appropriate placement to legal representation and action in support of the handicapped child and parents. Thus, although advocacy groups could influence school district policy, in general, this came about as a result of confrontation rather than collaborative efforts.

7. Department of Rehabilitation as Well as CETA Were Committed to Serving the Needs of Handicapped Persons in the Community.

Department of Rehabilitation and CETA policies, guided by federal guidelines and regulations, stated explicitly the need to provide rehabilitation, training and employment services to handicapped persons in the community. With regard to CETA, this mandate was operationalized as a requirement that each CETA funded training and employment program, including Title IV, In-School Youth programs, serve among its clients a percentage of handicapped, CETA-eligible persons. Although no data were available to researchers, CETA representatives in various sites indicated that a major effort was made to comply with this mandate.

B. DEFINITIONS, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

1. Definitions and Screening Procedures for Identifying Handicapped Students in Public LEAs Were Based Primarily on State and Federal Guidelines.

The definitions and the procedures used to identify handicapped students in the public schools and to determine the nature of their disabilities were formal and, in most cases, very predictable. They were based on state and particularly Federal guidelines, and included the following steps: (1) initial identification and referral of students to the guidance office or principal, primarily done by the classroom teacher, (2) review of students' academic and other school records, (3) administration of individualized psychological and achievement tests, and (4) review and discussion of all relevant student data at a "staffing" conference to determine appropriate placement. Although the composition of the committee varied, the staffing conference was usually attended by the principal, the guidance counselor, the teacher and a representative from the special education/exceptional student office. Parents, according to many respondents, although invited, often did not attend these meetings. In some districts, the school nurse also participated in the discussions.

2. Most Student Evaluation Occurred During the Early Elementary Grades.

The stress for identifying potentially handicapped students occurred in most school districts in the early elementary grades. Two reasons were identified: first, there was a strong emphasis for early identification and second, often the availability of special services for handicapped students tended to decrease sharply in the upper grades. In fact, in a number of rural schools and also in mid-size communities, there were no special services available for handicapped students at the comprehensive high schools so that any student who could not participate and succeed in regular classes was referred to a regional school or center. On the other hand, in most cases, including the rural school districts, some resource room and itinerant teacher services were available at the elementary level.

Usually, before handicapped students entered the high schools, a reevaluation of their school records and progress was made by the school or district Committee for the handicapped. The purpose of this review was to plan the students' high school program and, in some cases, to determine the most appropriate vocational options available. Surprisingly, in no case did vocational education teachers or administrators participate in these conferences.

3. Some Confusion Existed Over Definitions.

As indicated, the criteria for classifying handicapping conditions were based, most often, on federal guidelines. In general, no difficulties were apparent concerning the identification of students with physical, sensory and language handicaps and also the screening of those who were severely mentally retarded. There were considerable problems however with the criteria used to identify minimally retarded students, students with specific learning disabilities and also those with emotional handicaps. The confusion occurred because, in most cases, students in these categories were also academically disadvantaged and often had behavioral problems as well. This situation often created a need for subjective decisions on the part of local officials concerning the underlying causes of the students' problems.

To identify the students as learning disabled or emotionally handicapped would place the responsibilities for the problem clearly on some general or specific deficiencies within the students. On the other hand, to label the students as academically handicapped, could be interpreted by some as an indication that the schools were unable to provide adequate instructional services to a segment of its student population. As a result, "disadvantagement" sometimes became synonymous with "handicapped." Thus, one strategy used by three of the fifteen districts visited was to combine the two categories and simply label the students as "educationally or learning handicapped." However, one could find among these "handicapped" students many who were academically disadvantaged because of social, education, and economic conditions, not just personality or other psychological/perceptual factors. This could also explain, in part, the typical observation made by researchers concerning the overrepresentation of Black and male students in special education programs and classes.

4. Placement of Handicapped Students in Vocational Education Classes Depended on the Options Available in the School Districts.

As mentioned, handicapped students' records were reviewed generally before they entered high school grades. At that time, the "staffing" committee reviewing the records made recommendations for school and program placement, including separate and regular vocational education programs. More often than not, the recommendations were constrained by the options available in the school district. Thus, if the district operated separate programs for handicapped students in one or more high schools, recommendation for placement would be made to those schools, more or less automatically. Parental approval was needed, however, if the schools differed from the students' regularly zoned high school and transportation to and from school had to be provided. In rural districts, if the handicapped students were already attending a separate district or regional special education school, they would simply continue in the secondary programs offered at that school.

In only two cases did handicapped students' vocational interests and abilities, as determined by structured vocational evaluations, play a role in the recommendations for placement in regular programs. In neither instance, however, were the recommendations binding on the school staff. Principals, guidance counselors and even vocational education teachers had to agree to accept the students in their schools programs and classes.

5. Factors Affecting the Placement of Handicapped Students in Separate, Special Education/Vocational Education Programs.

The two principal factors affecting the placement of handicapped students in special vocational education programs were (1) the availability of those programs in the district and (2) the nature of the students' disabilities. Typically, in the larger cities and towns, the LEAs, through the years, had developed two major options for handicapped students: (a) separate programs in separate schools for the trainable mentally retarded students and for the multiple handicapped students, and (b) self-contained programs or classes in some of the high schools for the educable mentally retarded, the physically handicapped and some of the learning disabled and emotionally impaired. Where these options existed, handicapped students were channeled directly into the programs, based on their disability labels. Even though parents had to approve the placement, in reality, few were aware of alternative options for their children or were knowledgeable of their rights under state and federal laws.

In rural districts and also in mid-size communities where the LEAs had no special secondary programs for handicapped students, arrangements for academic and vocational education were often made with regional centers or county schools for exceptional children. Since the costs for such services were high, referrals tended to be limited to those students with the most severe disabilities who could not be served in the schools, such as the trainable mentally retarded, those with severe communication disabilities and the multiple handicapped. In such cases, the educable mentally retarded students, and especially the learning disabled and the emotionally impaired placed in the regular school programs without supportive services were the least well served.

6. Factors Affecting the Placement of Handicapped Students in Regular Vocational Programs.

In addition to the self-contained programs, some high schools offered resource, laboratory-type programs for the less severely handicapped students, including the learning disabled and some with emotional handicaps, and sensory impairments. Often, these centers were called "the mixed exceptionality resource rooms," and a variety of remedial education and individual guidance services could be coordinated and provided to the students through the centers. While it would appear that these students would have the best opportunities for placement in regular vocational education, often, schedule conflicts due to requirements for resource room service limited their access to the elective vocational programs.

The constraints limiting handicapped students' access to regular secondary vocational education programs could be broken down into the following three types: (1) attitudinal, (2) organizational, and (3) architectural, corresponding roughly to their order of importance.

a. Attitudinal.

A primary concern of vocational educators across sites was that recent efforts to raise their programs' standards and to improve their image would be affected if access to the programs by special education students was unrestricted. The fear expressed most often was that vocational education would be considered, once again, by guidance counselors and other school staff as "dumping grounds for problem children," inappropriately placed and without the support necessary to succeed. On the other hand, serious questions were also raised by special educators concerning the willingness and ability of vocational educators to modify their teaching practices in order to accommodate the special needs of handicapped students.

In part, the anxieties expressed by vocational educators may be due to the vocational program evaluation pressures exerted by the states inasmuch as quality of the programs was assessed solely on the basis of placement rates of students in occupations related directly to training. This was apparent in all five states visited by researchers. Since handicapped students, in general, were less likely to find employment immediately after training, vocational staff were reluctant to accept handicapped students and jeopardize the status of their programs.

From discussions with both central office administrators and school staff, it seemed clear that principals and vocational education teachers played important roles in determining whether handicapped students had equal access to regular vocational programs. The principals, by establishing overall school guidelines and by welcoming special education programs and handicapped students in their schools, could set the tone and encourage greater cooperation among guidance counselors and special and vocational education staff. Ultimately however, access to vocational programs depended on the teachers' acceptance of handicapped students in their programs. In some cases, vocational educators restricted explicitly the actual number of handicapped students who could be "mainstreamed," specifying the handicapping conditions acceptable to them and the particular programs in which they could be placed. In such cases, each student application for vocational education was screened by the vocational staff and their decisions were final. In other instances, while no actual limits were established, specific "safety" criteria had to be demonstrated by the students before placement.

Special educators as well, through their recommendations for placement into the various programs, placed limits on the number of students to be "mainstreamed." Often extreme precautions were taken not to exacerbate tensions between them and the vocational staff by (1) limiting recommendations to students who were most likely to succeed and (2) attempting to place these students in programs and classes that were taught by vocational teachers known to be sensitive to the special needs of handicapped students. Indeed, much of the efforts and many of the strategies used by special educators were directed toward either encouraging principals to provide services for handicapped students in their schools or modifying the attitudes and behaviors of vocational education teachers toward handicapped students. In all cases, special educators concluded that greater gains could be made by assuming a supportive rather than an adversarial role in the relationship with their vocational education colleagues. By accident or design, special educators were particularly careful not to create divisiveness and controversy in the schools over this issue.

Finally, parents' attitudes and perceptions may also be important factors. Many of the parents we spoke with seemed to prefer the sheltered environments of the separate vocational programs rather than to risk the possibility of their children failing or being ridiculed in the regular school programs. However, since only parents with children in separate programs were interviewed, this possibility must be considered tentative.

b. Organizational.

Not surprisingly, where vocational education opportunities for all students were limited because the demands exceeded the district's ability to provide adequate services, access for handicapped students decreased considerably. In all cases, priority for vocational education was given to advantaged students; then, when possible, consideration was given to the needs of handicapped students. In some states, Florida in particular, the state education agency placed limits on the number of students that could be enrolled in each of the occupational offerings based on local job market projections. As a result, preference was always given to students without special needs, especially when the demand for enrollment was high. Of course, in many such instances separate vocational projects were available for the handicapped students, although the range of vocational offerings in the special programs was much more limited.

Another organizational factor limiting some handicapped students' access to regular vocational programs was their need for special support services, including remedial reading and math institutions. Typically, regular vocational education programs were offered in blocks of two to three hours. This was especially true when programs were offered at skills centers or regional schools and the students needed to travel. Since the support services were available only at the home schools, the potential for conflict in the scheduling for handicapped students was always a limiting factor.

c. Architectural.

Architectural factors, although ranked as the least critical, were nevertheless barriers that limited access to regular programs for the physically disabled students. This was particularly true in the large urban centers where the vocational schools were built well before access for physically handicapped individuals was a legal and social issue. As a result, in many cities, the vocational options for physically handicapped students were limited to programs offered in the more modern structures that could accommodate their physical needs. Moreover, in communities which offered vocational services to their students through participation in regional vocational schools, programs or skills centers, the issue of special transportation for physically handicapped individuals was also a factor limiting access.

7. Handicapped Students in Community Colleges Were Identified Primarily Through Self-Referral.

In an attempt to provide special assistance and services to handicapped students, many of the community colleges included in the sample had recently established a handicapped student services office. The support services coordinated and provided through this office were often publicized in the catalogue of college courses and services, as well as in a variety of posters and brochures made available to students at the time of registration.

In most cases, handicapped students were identified through self-referrals although this was often done at the suggestion of an instructor or a guidance counselor. Typically, after the initial intake interview with a counselor, an individualized program was developed to meet the needs of the handicapped student. Depending on those needs, a program could be long-range (e.g., individualized counseling lasting through the period of a student's college enrollment) or could consist of providing the student with the necessary facilitative aides to overcome the specific problems. This passive identification approach, brought about in one case as a result of a lawsuit filed by a handicapped student against a college that was seeking to recruit students by reviewing records and identifying names on lists provided by other agencies, has led to a drop in the number of identified handicapped students served by the programs.

Two exceptions to the support-type services provided by most community colleges were institutions that established separate skills evaluation and development programs for handicapped individuals, in particular, the mentally retarded and physically handicapped. In these cases, the clients were referred to the schools and the programs for occupational assessment and training by a number of community agencies including the Department of Rehabilitation and the CETA office. In addition, regular college students could be referred for services to the programs by the guidance office, as well as by individual instructors. In such cases, students could be participating in the regular vocational programs as well as be receiving services in the form of on-the-job training or counseling from the separate programs.

8. Agencies in the Community Responsible for Identifying Handicapped Individuals.

Most State and federal laws required that public LEAs identify and provide services to handicapped individuals from Kindergarten to age 18. Beginning in 1981, P.L. 94-142 mandates services up to age 21 when the federal provisions are consistent with those of the states. From our discussions with local administrators, it appeared that in three of the five states, services were being provided by the LEAs to some handicapped students up to age 21. However, even in those three states, there was much confusion as to which agency was responsible for serving handicapped students beyond grade 12.

With regard to preschoolers, few LEAs were involved directly in the identification process. The program most often mentioned as responsible for identifying and providing services to preschool handicapped children was Head Start. Some notable exceptions, however, included an early childhood program for 18 month old handicapped children, administered by the Easter Seal Foundation working closely with a local education agency in Texas.

Of equal interest was the situation under California's "Master Plan for Special Education," making the state's Regional Developmental Centers responsible for the provision of services to non-school age handicapped individuals from birth to death. Although the Regional Developmental Centers did not provide services directly, they served as a clearinghouse coordinating the activities of the various public agencies serving the handicapped.

9. The Role of the Department of Rehabilitation in the Public Schools.

Sometimes before, but often after, handicapped students graduated from the public school system, some became eligible for services provided through the Department of Rehabilitation. In most cases, as a result of written agreements between the LEAs and Vocational Rehabilitation allowing the rehabilitation counselors access to student school records, the counselors were able to identify eligible clients and begin the appropriate casework prior to the students' graduation. In addition to the potential clients from the school system, referrals to the Department of Rehabilitation were also made by social service, employment, CETA and other public health agencies, as well as by private sources: doctors, hospitals, employers, friends, relatives and self.

10. Eligibility for Department of Rehabilitation Services.

In order to be eligible for Department of Rehabilitation services, an individual had to demonstrate a disability that resulted in a substantial handicap to employment. In addition, there needed to be a "reasonable expectation" that the individual could get and hold a job as a result of the rehabilitative services provided. Unfortunately, the latter condition often precluded the possibility that severely handicapped individuals would be serviced through the Department of Rehabilitation. Despite the legislative mandate to give this group first claim on vocational rehabilitation services, there was a tendency to be selective in the screening of clients since evaluations were based on the number of successful placements after provision of services.

C. PLANNING FOR VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS.

1. Most Reported Planning Activities for Handicapped Students Occurred at the School Level.

The key to understanding the planning process for vocational education for handicapped students in the public LEAs is to distinguish between planning for special needs projects for a group of handicapped students and program planning as required for the development of individualized educational plans (IEPs). In both instances, however, the circumstances under which planning occurred centered around the behaviors and attitudes of the school principals and their staffs.

2. Planning for Special Needs Projects Was Directly Related to Action.

Evidence of planning was apparent in those school districts adopting a strategy of using the VEA set-aside funds to develop specific vocational education projects for handicapped students. On the other hand, little or no planning was evident in school districts with no special needs vocational programs for handicapped students that used, however, the VEA funds to supplement work-study programs for preparing handicapped students for employment. Finally, there was no evidence of planning activities in some of the small rural districts that did not receive VEA set-aside funds for handicapped students.

3. Vocational Educators Were Rarely Involved Directly in the Planning for Vocational Education Special Needs Projects.

Typically, in school districts receiving VEA set-aside funds for handicapped students, planning was done separately by the Special Education staff after being informed by the Directors of Vocational Education about their approximate entitlement for the school year. The Special Education staff then met, individually or in a group, with the principals of the high schools that offered vocational/special education programs to determine their priority needs. Based on these needs, the special education staff developed the plans for a series of special needs projects for handicapped students to be included in the LEAs' proposal package forwarded to the state education agency. Prior to submission to the state however, the total application needed to be reviewed and approved by both the Advisory Council for Vocational Education and the school board. Sometimes, the special needs projects for handicapped students were reveiwed as well by the local representatives from the Department of Rehabilitation.

Thus, formal interaction between the special education and the vocational education central office staff occurred, in most cases, at two points in the planning process. The initial contact took place most often when the Vocational administrators first became aware of the approximate VEA entitlement for handicapped students. In addition to discussing the dollar amount available for programming, any limitations on the use of the funds that might have been imposed by the state were also outlined. The purpose of the second meeting, occurring generally after the special needs projects were developed and written, was to review and discuss strategies for obtaining board approval and to outline plans for implementation. The final responsibility for the actual planning, designing and writing for the projects, however, was left to the central office special education staff. Although there was considerable diversity, it appeared that vocational educators were most likely to be involved in the planning process when the special needs projects called for the use of licensed vocational education teachers to teach the handicapped students. In such cases, there was a constant need for discussions and feedback among the special educators, the principals and the vocational educators in the schools. These discussions, however, took place as needed on an informal rather than on a scheduled basis. The extent of the discussions varied also depending on the nature of the professional relationships established in the schools and on the willingness of the various staffs to cooperate.

In such cases, the principals played an important and visible role as gatekeepers since they decided whether their schools would participate in the special needs projects. Hence, gaining their cooperation became a key issue for the special education staff. And, often, the promise of additional project funds for their schools was the major stimulus used by the special educators to gain their participation.

4. External Participation in the Planning Process.

In none of the individual cases observed did a person outside of the school system emerge as an initiator or promoter in the planning process. For example, in all cases, the role of the local advisory councils seemed to have been fairly passive and was limited generally to the "sign off" requirements of the VEA proposal package prior to submission to the state for funding. This was due, in part, to the fact that, typically, none of the representatives on either the LEAs' general vocational education advisory councils or the individual crafts committees was identified specifically as an advocate for handicapped students. Representatives on these citizens advisory groups seemed to favor the general business community interests rather than those of special needs populations. Although advisory committees seemed at times to have decisive influence on the quality of the regular vocational education programs, they did not affect what eventually happened with respect to special needs projects.

In only one case did a representative from the state education agency contribute to the development of plans for the use of the VEA set- asides for handicapped students. This involvement, however, was limited to the dissemination of some curriculum materials and other publications related to the establishment of a vocational evaluation center. In general, there was rare mention of state education assistance or participation either in the planning and designing of special needs projects or in their implementation. Often, local administrators viewed the state officials as program auditors rather than as advisors and facilitators and, therefore, more often than not, the relationships between the two was considered adversarial.

5. Planning and Coordination of Resources for Special Needs Projects for Handicapped Students.

An important element in the coordination and utilization of resources for vocational education special needs projects for handicapped students was that the same group of administrators responsible for the VEA planning process was also involved in the administration of P.L. 94-142 funds. Thus, many opportunities existed for multiple uses of resources vital to the success of any one special needs project. This was particularly evident in the large school districts where some administrators were able to plan comprehensive special needs vocational education projects for handicappped students, allocating VEA funds for the purchase of equipment and materials and P.L. 94-142 funds for the salaries of teachers and support specialists.

6. Other Planning Strategies.

The overall analysis of the pattern of participation suggested that it was principally the special education central office staff members who contributed most to the planning of vocational education programs for handicapped students. Working initially with vocational administrators and then with principals and their school staff, the special educators sought to design projects that would increase vocational educational opportunities for handicapped students. Although teachers, students or the school community at large were not allowed to make decisive actions regarding vocational education plans for handicapped students, presumably through school committees, their influence was felt indirectly in various ways.

This pattern of participation, however, did not apply to cases where school districts served handicapped students principally through work-study, on-the-job training programs. In fact, in such instances, the participation of the special education staff was often quite limited, and the vocational education office seemed to be responsible for whatever planning activities did occur. It seemed that once the strategy for the use of the VEA set-aside funds for handicapped students had been established, planning activities were then limited to determining the number of "slots" available for handicapped students who would be participating in work-study programs alone and those who would be participating in combined vocational and work-study programs. Often, this determination was based on expected enrollments and vocational administrators would then inform special educators, guidance counselors and other persons at the school level who would be affected in one way or another by the decisions. Sometimes, for each of the programs, the assignment of "slots" specified as well the type of students who would be eligible for placement (e.g., learning disabled, physically handicapped or mentally retarded). The guidance counselors and special education staff were then responsible for selecting the students and ensuring that they were successful in the programs.

7. Planning for the Development of IEPs.

One consistent aspect of planning for special education students was the development of individualized education plans, as required by P.L.

94-142. In most cases, individual program planning was accomplished by a multidisciplinary school committee with the responsibilities to review each handicapped student's data and to recommend the most appropriate placement, including placement in vocational programs. Because of the legal requirements, all districts had established formal procedures to guide the work of the committee.

8. Composition of the School Committees for the Handicapped.

The compositions of the committees varied considerably from district to district, although usually, the principal of the school where the student was enrolled, the guidance counselor, the diagnostician, and the teacher involved with the student were key participating members. Typically, the committee met the semester before the student entered high school in order to recommend appropriate placement. Since the vocational education teachers were in the high schools, they were rarely involved in the procedures or consulted by the committee, although in a few cases, a central office vocational education representative or job placement specialist participated as a member. Parents, although generally invited, often did not attend the meetings held during school hours. However, all decisions affecting the placement of the students had to be approved by a parent; the procedures for informing parents and the energy expended for outlining alternatives and obtaining approval varied considerably from site to site however.

9. Factors Affecting Individual Student's Program Planning.

At this stage, the decision concerning placement of handicapped students seemed to depend primarily on four conditions, two of which were totally unrelated to the students' actual vocational needs, interests and behaviors. The primary consideration affecting plans for the students' program was the type of special education programs and services available in the school district. Typically, when separate vocational programs were operating in the district, students were usually channeled into these. The special education teachers were then responsible for the development of the IEPs and the writing of short- and long-term objectives based on the general recommendations made by the committee. In such cases, students' vocational options were usually limited to the those available through the separate programs and "mainstreaming" attempts were limited to the nonacademic or vocational offerings.

In districts where separate vocational programs were not available for handicapped students, placement typically depended on the nature of the students' disability. For the most severely disabled, including the multiple handicapped, the trainable mentally retarded, the physically disabled and the sensory impaired, arrangements were made for some out-of-district placement, either in regional centers, Board of Cooperative Services or private schools. Further considerations about vocational training and options depended on the programs available in those schools and were no longer the concerns of the committee. The less severely handicapped were usually "mainstreamed" in the regular school programs, with some provisions for special services, if available.

Rarely, however, did the committee make specific recommendations for placing the students into the regular vocational programs available in the schools. Typically, the specific programming decisions were left to the high school guidance counselors and ultimately the vocational education teachers. Thus, students' access to vocational education depended on the attitudes and behaviors of the school staff. From our discussions with the school staff, it appeared that, in general, students who were "potential troublemakers," that is, those classified as emotionally handicapped, were least likely to be acceptable to the vocational staff. On the other hand, those who had academic problems, either because of some specific learning disability or because they were mildly retarded, although acceptable to some vocational staff, were usually excluded from the more technical programs.

In only two separate instances did the committee make specific recommendations for placing some handicapped students directly into the regular vocational education programs. In each case, the decisions were made on the basis of extensive vocational screening and evaluations of the student's occupational interests and capabilities. Efforts were made by the vocational and special education central office staff to develop the capabilities for evaluating objectively the vocational education/training potential of some of the handicapped students in the two districts and for recording formally the assessment information as part of each student's "Vocational Plan." The plan was included as part of the data reviewed by the committee and, whenever possible, the vocational evaluator attended the "staffing" conference. Even when individual student program planning was made on objective data, however, the committee's recommendations were not binding on the school staff. Respondents could point to specific instances when the guidance counselors made alternative placement decisions because of other school-related, organizational factors.

An essential planning-related element in one of the two school districts conducting vocational evaluations was a follow-up conference two years later to determine whether the program recommendations for those students evaluated had been observed by the school staff and also to develop the students' "employability plan." In addition to the guidance counselor, these conferences were attended also by the school work-study coordinator and the district's employment counselor responsible for the placement of handicapped students.

Finally, it appeared that the least amount of planning and therefore, the fewest vocational options for handicapped students were in districts that used primarily on-the-job training methods for preparing handicapped students for employment. In such cases, handicapped students were generally excluded from vocational training and placed directly in separate special education programs that provided some work experiences.

10. Planning at the Community Colleges Varied Depending on the Types of Programs and Services Available for Handicapped Students.

The analysis of interview data suggested three separate patterns or strategies employed by community colleges for meeting the special needs of handicapped students. The most common strategy consisted of establishing an on-campus handicapped or exceptional student office to coordinate and provide a host of supportive services to the handicapped college students. The second strategy, observed in only two of the fifteen community colleges, was the development of separate vocational training programs or skills centers to meet the occupational and employment needs of handicapped students, especially the educable mentally handicapped and the physically handicapped. The third approach, essentially a non-strategy, placed the responsibility for providing the necessary assistance to any handicapped student on the regular college counselors who could solicit help from other faculty and staff on a case-by-case basis. Planning activities in the latter case were the least extensive.

11. Coordinated Planning to Provide Supportive Services to Handicapped Students.

In all cases, the stimulus for the establishment of on-campus handicapped student services centers seemed to be the availability of state and federal funds for services to handicapped students. The presence of such centers, supported primarily with state funds, provided in most all cases the mechanism through which the deans of vocational/technical education could channel the VEA set-aside funds to provide additional support services to handicapped students enrolled in the occupational programs.

The typical planning pattern consisted of a series of meetings, before deadlines for VEA applications, between the dean of vocational/technical education and the directors of student support services, including guidance, placement, resource centers and handicapped student centers. The purpose of the meetings was to consider the special needs of the handicapped college students and to examine how those needs could best be met by coordinating available resources (federal, state and local) and thus, supplementing the student services (e.g., counseling, tutorial, facilitative aides, etc.) provided by each office. In general, before the plans could be presented to the state, they had to be submitted for approval by the Community College Vocational Advisory Council, the president of the college and the Board of Trustees. Other than the review of plans by the general vocational education advisory council, there was very little direct input to the planning process by community-based groups. This is not to say, however, that relationships between the community colleges and outside groups such as vocational rehabilitation or work-training centers for handicapped individuals did not exist. On the contrary, such relationships, based either on formal agreements or on more personal and professional contacts, were much more prevalent at the community college level than at the public school level. Indeed, some resourceful college administrators, particularly in Florida and California, were successful in forming linkages with trade unions and Department of Rehabilitation representatives to encourage the recruitment of selected disabled college students for participation in a variety of apprenticeship programs.

12. Planning for Separate Occupational Programs for Handicapped College Students.

The more formal relationships between the community college and outside organizations such as vocational rehabilitation and CETA were most salient when the college provided separate occupational programs for handicapped individuals. Moreover, since the programs usually required multiple sources of funding and served clients in the community at large in addition to handicapped college students, planning was usually based on formal needs assessment procedures guided by a separate project advisory committee. Finally, unlike the brief VEA applications, the narratives for these projects tended to be detailed descriptions of goals, objectives, procedures and strategies for serving the handicapped clients.

In each of the two cases observed, the skills programs were the result of the joint efforts of three agencies, namely, the community college, the Department of Rehabilitation and, to a lesser extent, the local CETA office. Each agency contributed to the operation of the program and each was represented on the project advisory council which included as well members from business, labor, and lay community people. In general, designing and developing the specifics for the projects were left up to the project directors working with their respective staff based on the needs of the population served. Each director, however, was responsible directly to the Dean of Instruction and the College Board of Trustees, in addition to the project advisory board. Finally, because the project directors had faculty status, they participated in a variety of college-wide committees as represensentives of the interests of all handicapped college students.

13. Community-based Organizations Planned Their Programs Independently.

Community-based organizations serving the special needs of handicapped persons tended to be of two types: those providing direct occupational and training services, and those acting as advocates for handicapped individuals. The organizations providing direct occupational services and assisting the handicapped for employment were generally private, nonprofit agencies supported partly with funds from the Department of Rehabilitation for services rendered to eligible clients, and partly through private contracting. On the other hand, the advocacy groups were generally supported through private membership contributions. Generally, each organization headed by a director, conducted its own planning independently and was responsible for its programming and fiscal well being to a board of directors. Financial agreements usually existed only with the Department of Rehabilitation and, less frequently, with private employers and with the CETA Prime Sponsor. Rarely were the agencies involved directly with the LEAs or the community colleges, although the directors, through personal contacts, were generally aware of the types of services provided by the public educational agencies. The one exception was in California where, on the basis of a memorandum of understanding, "crisis" counselors from a community-based organization were placed in each of the local high schools. The relationship between this CBO and the LEA was based on an 80-20 percent matching of costs, the LEA contributing the lesser amount. Unfortunately, because of fiscal constraints resulting from the passage of Proposition 13, the LEA could no longer contribute its share and the relationship was subsequently terminated.

14. The Role of Vocational Rehabilitation Relative to the Public School System had Decreased Considerably Within the Last Few Years.

With the passage of P.L. 94-142 providing that the school district shall be the public agency legally responsible for identification and assessment of an individual's exceptional needs and the planning of an instructional program to best meet the assessed needs, the role of vocational rehabilitation in the public schools has changed considerably. Whereas prior to the legislation financial agreement existed between the two agencies and vocational rehabilitation representatives were often involved with the LEAs, and in particular the vocational education and special education staff, in the planning of vocational and rehabilitation programs, now the interaction was much more limited. In most cases, memoranda of understanding were drawn between the two public agencies allowing the vocational rehabilitation counselors some access to handicapped students' school records, as well as the opportunity to identify potential clients after they completed school. In the state of Florida, the other formal contact consisted of the state requirement that the vocational rehabilitation representative sign off on each LEA's special needs, handicapped student portion of the VEA application prior to its submission for funding.

15. Each of the Local Offices of the Department of Rehabilitation Planned Its Programs Independently.

Each regional office of the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation was responsible for developing annual plans identifying the community's needs, establishing goals and defining the strategies to achieve those goals and to meet the assessed needs. In general, the planning activities were carried out by the staff independently, taking into account, on the one hand, the unique needs and resources available in each community and, on the other, federal and state mandates to provide services. Although the planning was done independently, in many cases, the Department of Rehabilitation had written cooperative agreements with most other public service agencies in the communities, sometimes including the community college and some of the CBOs.

D. STRATEGIES FOR SERVING HANDICAPPED PERSONS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. Range of Vocational Options for Handicapped High School Students.

The findings regarding the types of secondary vocational education and work-experience programs and options available to handicapped students at the LEAs pointed to considerable diversity and complexity. It is difficult, therefore, to draw many generalizations. Nevertheless, there were some similarities emerging from the fifteen cases suggesting some common strategies or approaches used by school administrators to meet the special needs of handicapped students.

Following are descriptions of the types of vocational and work-experience programs found at the local school level, as well as observations concerning options most typically available to handicapped students.

a. Regular Vocational Education Programs in Comprehensive High Schools.

According to respondents, the primary purpose of the regular vocational education programs was to provide interested and motivated high school students with the necessary entry level skills required for successful employment in a variety of trades and occupations. A secondary consideration was to prepare students for continued post-secondary training in two- and four-year institutions.

The quality of the regular programs, the range of occupational offerings and, therefore, the ability to achieve those objectives depended, in part, on whether the program options for students were limited only to those offered in the comprehensive high schools. Indeed, in four of the 15 sites visited (three rural and one mid-size community), the vocational education programs consisted solely of courses offered in the comprehensive high school. The typical offerings included courses in Agriculture, Business, Home Economics and various trades, technical and industrial (e.g., Drafting, Auto Mechanics, Manufacturing, Electricity, Masonry, etc.). In each case, respondents agreed that for most students, these programs, even when supplemented with work experiences, tended to be exploratory and were not adequate to provide basic entry level skills.

b. Extending Regular Vocational Education Program Options for All Students.

In order to extend the regular vocational program options for all students, some of the LEAs had adopted a variety of strategies, including the establishment of (1) vocational skills centers within the school district, (2) intra- and inter-district Regional Occupational Programs (ROPs), (3) vocational education high schools, and (4) the use of Boards of Cooperative Education Services. The particular strategy adopted depended on a number of local considerations, as well as state educational policies and guidelines. Nevertheless, in each case the intent was to broaden the vocational education opportunities for students. Except for those attending vocational high schools (found primarily in two of the five large cities), most students enrolled in these programs needed to be bused in order to receive training.* In general, the vocational programs offered through these alternate options were more technically-oriented and demanding than those offered in the comprehensive high schools.

c. Regular Vocational Education as an Option for Handicapped Students.

The distinction between regular vocational programs in high schools and those in regional skills centers and vocational high schools is key to understanding the vocational options available for handicapped students in the regular programs. In general, when handicapped students were enrolled in regular programs, they were more likely to be placed in the comprehensive schools than in the more technical vocational centers. As a result, their options were much more limited than those of their more advantaged peers.

The seeming predictability of this pattern of participation in vocational programs may be due to several factors. First, as indicated, programs in the skills centers tended to be more demanding and usually students had to meet various academic and "behavior" prerequisites for admission. Second, the techncial vocational staff at the centers appeared to be more "business" oriented than their counterparts in the comprehensive schools and thus, tended to be less tolerant of atypical student behaviors, especially potentially distruptive ones. Finally, since support resource-type services, when available for high school handicapped students in the districts, were provided only in the comprehensive schools the scheduling for these students posed a number of logistic problems. As a result, it was often more expedient to limit handicapped students' placement to regular vocational courses in the comprehensive schools. Moreover, respondents argued that, from an educational perspective, it made more sense to attempt to place the handicapped students in programs where, if necessary, the vocational teachers could meet with the students' resource support team, and their other academic teachers to discuss and attempt to resolve problems as they came up. Such meetings among staff would be less likely when the situation involved two separate schools.

---

* It is possible that a student attending a comprehensive high school may enroll in an ROP located at that high school and, therefore, not need to travel.

d. Regular Vocational Programs with Special Services for Handicapped Students.

Generally, the types of special education students participating in some of the vocational skills center programs were the physically handicapped, and, in a few instances, the sensory impaired, especially those who were hard-of-hearing. With regard to the physically handicapped, as long as the students could meet the academic and vocational standards, the major issues were transportation and physical access to the facilities. In most cases, school districts were able to resolve these problems satisfactorily. The strategy for serving the hard-of-hearing students consisted of providing trained interpreters who could assist the students while they attended vocational classes.

Another common LEA strategy was to provide services to handicapped students placed in regular vocational education in the comprehensive schools through participation in resource-type programs. Of particular interest, however, was the fact that not all comprehensive high schools in a district offered such programs for handicapped students. Although resource programs existed for a number of years in most elementary schools, the extension of the services to the upper grades appeared to be a recent development in most cases. In fact, in several rural and mid-sized communities, as well as one large city, no support-type program was available for handicapped students at the secondary level. In effect then, if the school committee determined that the students could not function in the regular programs, they were placed in separate, self-contained special education programs within the district or in regional centers. If, on the other hand, the committee determined that the students could function in the regular programs, then they were expected to do so without the benefit of special services.

Whether or not a resource program existed in the high schools often depended on the willingness of the principals to support the program. The fact that not all schools provided such service meant that students for whom such programs were recommended often had to travel to neighboring schools that provide such services. Because of declining enrollment in the high schools however, principals and counselors were reluctant to approve such inter-district transfers.

e. Separate Special Education-Vocational Programs for Handicapped Students.

A central finding emerged or was reaffirmed by our analysis, that is, separate, self-contained programs for handicapped students were the most common and predictable ways school districts provided for the majority of their handicapped students. Two types were identified: those that operated within the regular comprehensive high schools and those that operated in separate school buildings.

Self-Contained Within the High School. Self-contained special education programs within the high schools were typically housed in a separate wing of the school or contained in a series of trailers adjacent to the school building. The majority of the students participating in these special education programs were identified primarily as minimally mentally handicapped or educable mentally retarded. Nevertheless, a considerable number of learning disabled and emotionally impaired were also included, especially when the district did not offer alternate options appropriate for them. It appeared as well that many academically disadvantaged students, mostly Black males, who generally tested poorly on individually administered psychological tests, were also included among this population of students.

These separate special education programs generally provided academic, as well as some vocational training to students. To say that the programs generally prepared the handicapped students adequately for meaningful employment would be misleading however. Both the quality of the programs and the vocational options available varied considerably.

In some cases, where the skills courses were taught by certified vocational educators, there appeared to be serious efforts to provide the students with salable entry level skills. Some of the more typical categories of courses offered included: Agriculture, Food Services (including meal planning and preparation), Home Economics and Industrial Arts.

Although not always successful, efforts were made to place these students in community positions related to their area of training. Another factor that seemed important was the extent to which the special education program was viewed by the principal and the staff as an integral part of the school.

The situation differed considerably however, in cases where the programs were totally staffed by nonvocationally oriented teachers. Then, the emphasis was placed on developing appropriate general work habits rather than specific occupational skills. Preparation for employment consisted solely of the work experience and on-the-job training programs. Placement however, was limited to low-skill, low-pay and high-turnover occupations such as fast food servers, gas station attendants, general office workers, custodial helpers and so forth. In most cases, placement was limited to in-school positions, although, some attempts were made to place the more able and responsible students in community jobs.

Separate Facility. In contrast to the in-school vocational options for handicapped students described above, all school districts provided services in separate facilities for severely handicapped students, primarily the trainable mentally retarded and the multiple handicapped. This pattern of service delivery was consistent across sites, except that in rural and mid-size communities the services were provided in regional special education schools, while in large cities, the districts administered their own programs.

Except for one, vocational programs for this population were non-skills, world of work programs. Students were prepared for employment through placement in on-campus training stations with varying levels of responsibilities. As students progressed, the more able were placed, when possible, in off-campus positions. Typically, the nature of the training led to low-skill low-paying jobs.

Again, the quality of the programs varied from site to site. In some cases, schools had developed for each area of training sets of specific behavioral objectives and competencies that students had to acquire. Individual students' competencies were made part of the students' records. In other cases however, little or no attention was given to systematic assessment and, often, the programs lacked direction. In only one case in Florida did a school for severely handicapped students offer skills training programs. The school, a K through 12 facility, provided an academic, prevocational, as well as a vocational curriculum to the students. In addition, the school enjoyed the services of a number of specialists who, emphasizing behavior therapy techniques, worked with students individually and in groups to reinforce socially acceptable behaviors. The process through which the students were placed in one of the occupational training programs offered at the school depended on both their interests and capabilities. Beginning in Grade 7 and continuing through Grade 9, the students were exposed to a combined academic and vocational program. One part of the day was devoted to academics and, if necessary, appropriate behavior therapy. During the other part, the students were introduced to the various vocational programs available in the school. In the three year span, the students were rotated systematically through all of the occupational offerings that included: Agriculture, Ornamental Horticulture, Building Maintenance, Hospital Maintenance, Hotel/Motel, Child Care, Laundry/Dry Cleaning, Sewing, Woodwork, Ceramics, and Food Services. Each of these programs was taught by a certified vocational education teacher assigned to the school.

When the student was in Grade 10, after a conference with the teachers (special education and vocational education), the school resource staff, the principal, the parents and the students, a decision was made narrowing the occupational training to two areas. Then, one half of the year was spent in one occupation and the second half in the other. Finally, based on performance, a recommendation was made by the staff to place the student in one area for intensive training during the 11th and 12th grade. Paid vocational work experiences, both on campus and off campus if available were provided to the student in Grade 12.

What seemed to make this school particularly successful was the remarkable leadership exhibited by the principal and his ability to coordinate and utilize all the intellectual, material and financial resources available in the school to serve the students. The school programs were strongly supported by the central administration, the school staff (special education and vocational education) and the parents. The process for both school program planning and individual student program planning seemed to be truly participatory and none of the tensions between vocational education and special education teachers observed in other instances was evident.

With regard to the vocational curriculum, teachers were requested to follow the regular scope and sequence for each course but to modify the activities as necessary. According to the teachers, except for safety modification in the power shops (e.g., the placement of switches to cut off electric currents in case of emergency), the major differences were the need for repetition and review rather than curriculum changes.

f. Work Experience and Cooperative Education Programs.

Most of the LEAs visited adopted some form of work experience and cooperative education programs as a method of vocational instruction. These programs were offered to provide students, including some handicapped students, the opportunity to work while still enrolled at the high schools. Essentially, two types of programs were available to students: vocational cooperative education programs and general work experience programs.

Cooperative Vocational Education Programs. The cooperative programs were limited to vocational education students and were designed to provide them with opportunities for on-the-job training in areas of employment related to their course of study. Typically, students were placed in the programs after or concurrent with vocational instruction at the high school or skills centers. The programs were administered by occupational area supervisors who, with the vocational staff, were responsible for securing jobs and coordinating various activities including: securing training agreements requiring signatures from employers, parents and students, developing individual training plans, distributing and collecting employer evaluation forms, and in the case of state approved programs, completing Targeted Jobs Credit forms.

The opportunities for handicapped students benefiting from such programs were very limited, if any. First, because the cooperative programs were usually targeted for regular vocational students, only those handicapped students enrolled in such programs could be eligible. Second, recommendation and priority for placement was usually given to the most able vocational students, often as a reward for their performance. Thus, except in communities with rapidly expanding job markets, the opportunities were limited even for the handicapped students placed in the regular vocational programs.

Work-Study Programs. Work-study programs designed to orient students to the general world of work were the most typical options available for handicapped students. Moreover, in most LEAs, a specified number of handicapped students eligible for CETA youth programs were placed in CETA-funded, in-school positions. As indicated, however, the quality of these work-study programs varied. Some provided structured and supervised experiences, while others were used simply as the mechanism to provide to the students some income during their junior and senior years. Two factors seemed to determine the quality of these programs: (1) the designation of a specific job counselor or developer in the schools whose primary function was to secure placements for the handicapped students into various slots and (2) the strategy adopted by the LEAs concerning the teaching of occupational skills to handicapped students in the separate, self-contained programs. When skills training was an option for the handicapped students, successful work experiences seemed to be much more likely. Not surprisingly, in such instances, one would commonly find a job developer associated with the program. Moreover, the vocational education teachers, through personal contacts, appeared to be more willing to seek placements for the handicapped students, at least for those most able.

2. Different Interpretations of "Mainstreaming."

Invariably, our questions about "mainstreaming" of handicapped students brought forth comments that schools attempted as much as possible to place the students in the least restrictive environments. Upon further questioning, however, it became clear that there were varying interpretations of the concept. As an example, despite the stated general policy to "mainstream," rarely did the schools expend major efforts to place handicapped students in the regular vocational education programs and provide appropriate supplementary services. On the contrary, the major strategy seemed to favor the support of seperate, self-contained programs. Nevertheless, administrators seemed to believe strongly that they were complying with the "mainstreaming" mandates when the handicapped students placed in the separate programs ate lunch or participated in music or art activities with their more advantaged peers.

Another example of the misconception was when administrators in a separate school for exceptional children suggested that "mainstreaming" occurred when children of varying exceptionalities were brought together for various academic and nonacademic activities. These varying interpretations raise serious questions about LEA compliance with the mandate of P.L. 94-142, as well as the intent of the vocational education legislation.

3. Local School District Strategies for the Use of VEA Set-Aside Funds for Handicapped Students.

As indicated earlier, except for the two districts that used work-study programs as the primary approach to preparing handicapped students for employment, planning for VEA special needs projects was done principally by the special education central office staff. In all such cases, definite strategies for the use of the set-asides could be identified. The two principal objectives of the strategies were: (1) to increase the vocational education opportunities for handicapped students and (2) to increase the representation of handicapped students in regular vocational education and work experience programs. Special educators attempted to achieve these objectives incrementally by using the VEA dollars as a stimulus to modify the behaviors and attitudes of the principals and their staff, particularly the guidance counselors and the vocational teachers. The findings in this regard follow.

a. Allocation of VEA Set-Aside Funds Were Used Often as Seed Money to Encourage Principals to Offer Vocational Programs for Handicapped Students and to Support Those Who Did.

At a time when the availability of tax-levy school funds was generally declining, special educators often used the federal VEA funds as a lure or a stimulus to encourage and motivate principals to establish separate vocational educationl programs for handicapped students. The promises of an infusion of dollars for new materials and equipment, the potential for additional teacher positions, as well as the availability of extra guidance and support service personnel were, at times, sufficient to win over the cooperation of some principals. This was a critical first step because, organizationally, most directors of special education had no formal authority over instructional programs at the high schools and principals were free to act and administer their programs independently. As respondents in different LEAs suggested, as long as parents in the school did not complain and students scored reasonably well on achievement tests, the superintendents and their key deputies were not likely to interfere with high school principals.

In cases where a new program for handicapped students was to be established, often the VEA funds would go toward the purchase of new equipment and materials needed for the program. Similarly, part of the VEA set-aside allocation was used to maintain and sometimes upgrade ongoing special needs special needs programs in other high schools or in the separate schools for exceptional children. In this regard, special educators in one large school district were committed to support new programs for a period of three consecutive years, after which each principal was responsible for maintaining the program using funds from the school's tax-levy budget.

b. Strategies to Increase Representation of Handicapped Students in Regular Vocational Programs Included the Establishment of Vocational Evaluation Centers.

Two LEAs, one in a large city--the other in a mid-size community, used within the last two years part of their VEA set-aside allocation for handicapped students to establish mobile vocational evaluation centers. In the large city. the center was a school program originated by the exceptional student office and supported partly with VEA funds for materials and equipment, and partly with P.L. 94-142 funds for the salaries of the evaluators and assistants. On the other hand, in the smaller community, the center was a county program planned and developed by the LEA in cooperation with the Department of Rehabilitation and CETA, and supported jointly by the three agencies. In both cases, however, the purpose and objectives were similar; that is, to increase the representation of handicapped students in regular programs by providing valid and objective assessments of students' vocational interests and abilities through standardized testing and analysis of work sample behaviors.

The expected outcome for each student was a rational individualized vocational plan, included in the IEP, that would be acceptable to guidance counselors, work-experience coordinators and vocational educators. In so doing, the hope was to alleviate the fear expressed often by vocational educators that their classes and programs would become "a dumping ground for problem children." By presenting "objective and realistic" evidence about handicapped students' vocational potential and by specifying the types of instructional and other support services needed and available, special educators expressed the hope that vocational teachers would be more willing to "mainstream" the students in the regular vocational and work experience programs. Moreover, the students would benefit as well from knowing better their individual strengths and limitations and also from setting employment goals that matched their needs and interests.

c. The Use of VEA Set-Aside Funds to Provide Supplementary Services to Handicapped Students in Regular Programs Was Rare.

In only one case, a metropolitan center, were the VEA set-aside funds used to provide appropriate supplementary support services to handicapped students. This was in the form of interpreters for hard-of-hearing students placed in the regular vocational programs at one of the skills centers.

In speaking with vocational education teachers, many indicated a willingness to accept handicapped students if school aides were available for continuous monitoring and supervision of the students. Nevertheless, LEAs, often because of state constraints on the use of the funds, rarely opted for this strategy. Even when such a strategy was used, as in the case of one large school district, the results were disappointing. Each high school in the district offering services to handicapped students was allocated a small budget for instructional/vocational aides. Unfortunately, the individual teachers were then responsible for screening, selecting and hiring the aides. These time-consuming procedures included completing and filing job applications for approval by the district personnel office. According to the teachers, the administrative procedures and "red tape" involved were so cumbersome, that often the funds would be unused or, in most cases, used for other than their intended purpose.

Finally, there seemed to be some reluctance on the part of school vocational administrators to use the VEA set-aside funds to provide support services for handicapped students since many felt that such services were already available in the schools and were funded adequately through state and federal special education programs. The need to update equipment and materials for vocational programs for handicapped students was cited most often as the best use of the set-aside funds.

d. Despite Indications That Often Vocational Education Teachers Lacked Critical Skills Needed to Work Successfully With Handicapped Students, VEA Funds Were Not Used For In-Service Training.

A major concern identified by vocational education administrators in large and small school districts was the recruitment of qualified staff. The difficulty, it seemed, was their inability to retain and motivate young qualified teachers when rewards and opportunities in business and industry were considerably greater than those in education. As a result, many teachers in the systems were retired businessmen or servicemen with limited teacher education experience in general, and education of the handicapped in particular.

Although some schools, through state and local funds, provided for in-service education of teachers, the major focus tended to be on useful teaching strategies to raise the academic competence of all students. Moreover, because of union contracts, participation in in-service programs was selective and, as suggested by some administrators, those who needed help most were usually the ones least likely to attend. In general, vocational education teachers were more or less left on their own to complete the requirements for permanent certification or for working with special education students. In some instances, state vocational education departments, through their regional offices, offered workshops or conferences that could be attended by some vocational teachers. Attendance at these conferences was supported in part with state and local funds (e.g., substitute teachers and travel costs) and often attendees were required to brief their colleagues at scheduled staff meetings. In no case, however, did the reseachers find a situation where the VEA set-aside funds were used systematically by an LEA to provide in-service education to vocational teachers working with handicapped students.

e. VEA Funds Were Rarely Used For Curriculum Revisions as an Intervention Strategy for Handicapped Students in Regular Vocational Programs.

Except for occasional attempts by some motivated teachers to individualize instruction for handicapped students in their classes, in no case were vocational education teachers asked or provided with the resources to make significant shifts in their role behaviors or expectations with respect to the curriculum for handicapped students. In many instances, curriculum modifications were not made because, according to vocational educators, a major state criterion for assessment of their programs was the number/percentage of students placed in jobs for which they were trained after completion of the program. As a result, teachers were unwilling to broaden or modify the curriculum and, in general, placed particular emphasis on the acquisition of the required entry level occupational skills. This fact produced considerable anxiety on the part of many teachers who felt they were expected to teach the required technical skills to the handicapped students despite the lack of resources to do so or special considerations because of students' handicaps. An important factor that seemed to pervade most all cases was confusion among vocational teachers about what "mainstreaming" was and what specifically they were to do and for what they would be held accountable. This confirmed strongly our findings that lack of knowledge and attitudes among vocational teachers were major barriers impeding handicapped students' access to regular vocational programs.

4. VEA Set-Aside Funds for Handicapped College Students Were Used Primarily to Provide Support-Type Services.

Based on the overall analysis, the most common pattern of service delivery to handicapped college students appeared to be one of individualized support service systems. Special counseling, guidance, and individualized program planning activities were the services most often cited by administrators. However, depending on the size of the college and the number of handicapped students enrolled, a variety of other services were available, including: educational tutoring, basic education and survival skills classes, interpreters and note takers for the orthopedically impaired and the deaf, reader service for the blind, mobility aids, financial and health assistance, job placement, and follow-through services.

Two strategies for supplementing such services with VEA set-aside funds were identified. First, since many of the above services were available to all college enrolled students through the usual Student Services Programs (e.g., Guidance, Placement, Health, Learning and Tutorial Centers), some college vocational administrators used the set-aside to support the programs and, in effect, "purchase" the services of a staff member who would focus primarily on the needs of the handicapped students enrolled in occupational programs.

The second more recent strategy, found especially in the larger community colleges that had established an Exceptional Student Center, consisted of using the VEA funds to supplement the center's activities for the benefit of the vocational handicapped students. Thus, the Exceptional Student Office became the college's "one-stop" service center providing supportive help to all handicapped students, including those enrolled in occupational programs.

The extent and the nature of the services varied depending on the needs of the students based on intake interview procedures and review of available student records. In some cases, the coordinated help extended beyond the services typically available through the college. Specialized help such as therapy or psychological and vocational assessments could be arranged through the center with various community agencies, including mental health centers and the Department of Rehabilitation. Finally, because there was within the college an identifiable office with a director acting as an advocate for handicapped students, architectural and programmatic changes to increase disabled students' access to facilities, buildings, as well as resource centers and program could be effected more easily.

5. In a Few Cases Community Colleges Offered Separate Vocational Skills Training Programs for Handicapped College Students and Other Community Clients.

As indicated above, most community colleges attempted, as much as possible, to "mainstream" the enrolled handicapped college students in the regular occupational programs while providing the support services necessary to succeed. However, the number of handicapped students, in particular the emotionally and mentally disabled, enrolled in such programs was relatively small. In order to increase enrollment, most schools participated in various community outreach activities, informing high school counselors and community agency representatives of the opportunities available for all handicapped students.

Two community colleges, however, responded more directly to the need for attracting more physically, emotionally, or mentally handicapped students by establishing separate on-campus skills training centers. As a result, the centers could draw on clients from the enrolled college student population, as well as from the community at large. For example, clients could be referred for services to the college skills centers from the Department of Rehabilitation, from CETA, as well as from other community agencies. The services provided to the clients through the centers were transitional and many, upon completion of the program, enrolled for further training in the colleges' regular occupational programs. Alternatively, some handicapped individuals participated concurrently in both the regular programs and some of the special services offered through the centers.

Some of the services/programs offered through the skills centers included: (1) personal adjustment training, e.g., independent living skills including communication skills, money and banking, personal hygiene, etc.; (2) work adjustment training, e.g., employability skills, development of appropriate work behaviors while working on increasingly more complex tasks in sheltered workshop environments, and continued remedial academic training and GED preparation; (3) vocational skills training through enrollment in either the regular college occupational programs or through continued on-the-job, paid training experiences in the workshops; and (4) placement programs that included limited follow-through services. In each case, the nature of the individual student program was based on a thorough vocational assessment conducted by the staff. For clients referred by the Department of Rehabilitation, the individual case materials included as well the results of psychological and medical examinations.

6. Community Colleges Actively Sought to Establish Ties with Community Agencies and in Some Cases, with the LEAs and with Local Industry.

To a large degree, the community college was the focal agency, often acting as the catalyst in bringing together various community agencies serving the needs of handicapped individuals. Vocational education administrators and Exceptional Student Center directors often called upon representatives from the Department of Employment, the Department of Rehabilitation, and CETA-funded community-based organizations to provide support for the college enrolled handicapped students. Moreover, the colleges often shared materials and provided assistance to community-based organizations that usually served the more severely handicapped individuals not able to participate in the college programs. In some cases, college instructors assigned to the community-based organizations conducted classes for the handicapped clients.

Researchers also found that most community colleges had established, in varying degrees, numerous linkages with other institutions, LEAs, and in particular, private employers within the communities. Each arrangement could be considered a stragegy for improving the delivery of occupational services and training to all students, thus affecting indirectly the vocational options available to handicapped students. Through the local Chamber of Commerce and the private industry councils, many community colleges had developed a variety of innovative programs using local industries as training grounds for their students. In some cases, the students trained and worked at the local factories in the midst of ongoing industrial production and services. In other instances, local industries or new industries to the area would suggest, often through the Chamber of Commerce, that the community college train and prepare a specific number of individuals on campus for particular occupations. Depending on the nature of the work, the colleges often attempted to recruit handicapped students among those trained for specific purposes, especially when employers set aside a number of slots for them. Nevertheless, preference was always given to those who were most able to perform.

7. Personal Adjustment Services, Pre-Vocational Services and Some On-the-Job Occupational Training in Sheltered Workshops Were the Major Strategies Used by Community-Based Agencies Serving the Handicapped.

Private, nonprofit organizations such as the Association for Retarded Citizens, the Goodwill Industries and a variety of county rehabilitation and work training centers were the principal agencies providing direct work training services to handicapped individuals in the communities. The clients referred to these agencies by the Department of Rehabilitation, the Department of Employment, CETA, and other public and private agencies were severely handicapped, primarily mentally retarded.

Typically, the organizations operated a variety of programs, including: vocational assessment and screening, personal adjustment services, prevocational training, and limited occupational training through client participation in sheltered workshop activities. Placement and follow-through services were also available for a few of the more able clients. Those who could not be placed could participate in the sheltered workshops indefinitely. Often, the complexity of the tasks in the workshops varied depending on the training programs available and the types of private contracting work the agency was able to generate. In some cases, agencies were able to provide clients on-the-job training skills in a variety of income producing programs such as landscaping, horticulture, kitchen and food services, furniture reupholstering, and so forth. In other cases, however, the sheltered workshop activities were limited to several, repetitive sorting type tasks. The assignment of tasks depended on the ability of the clients to do the work and their wages reflected the complexity of their assignments.

8. Two Major Gaps in the Services Provided to Handicapped Individuals in Community Agencies Were Identified.

A persistent point of criticism among certain community advocates for handicapped individuals of the services provided by community-based organizations was the apparent exclusion of emotionally impaired and learning disabled individuals. Despite provisions in the vocational rehabilitation legislation to the contrary, many respondents seemed to feel that these individuals were not eligible for Department of Rehabilitation services and even if they could afford the agency's private tuition costs, the programs available were often not adequate for their special needs.

A second problem identified concerned the abruptness of the transition from the sheltered workshop environments to competitive employment for the few more able clients served by the agencies. Often, the follow-through support services available were limited to a few visits by the counselor to the place of employment during the first few months of work. Clearly, many respondents felt that this was insufficient to facilitate the process of entry or reentry in the labor force and the small number of success stories appeared to support their contention. The community college skills programs described above could perhaps meet this apparent need. Unfortunately, such programs did not represent the typical strategy employed in most of the communities visited.

9. Some Limited Training and Employment Services for Emotionally Impaired and Learning Disabled Were Provided by CETA.

The CETA Prime Sponsors and their subcontractors were required to provide services to handicapped individuals in the community. Perhaps because--or in addition to their specific handicaps, emotionally impaired and learning disabled individuals often met the required economic eligibility criteria for services. As a result, some of these handicapped individuals, often labeled as academically and economically disadvantaged, participated in the employment development and training programs offered through CETA.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS.

A major focus of the research was the utilization of resources of various kinds--information, materials, people and dollars--used to support vocational programs and services for handicapped persons. A few of the highlights might be noted.

1. At the LEA Level, VEA Funds Were Often Used in Coordination With Other State and Federal Funds Earmarked for Special Education Programs.

In those school districts operating separate VEA special needs projects for handicapped students, few seemed hindered in any significant way by lack of financial resources. Most of the financial support came from state and federal P.L. 94-142 funds for special education with local tax-levy funds used primarily to pay for the salaries of vocational teachers. In general, the VEA set-aside funds were used to purchase or maintain equipment and materials for the separate shops.

The coordination of internal and external sources of funds was possible because the same administrators responsible for planning the VEA special needs projects were also administering the state and federal funds earmarked for special education. Moreover, despite the lack of formal planning between the special education and the vocational education central office staff, the relationship between the two was generally good and informal discussions occurred often. In most cases, this relationship had a relatively long history dating back to when joint financial agreements existed between vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and special education. As a result, the special needs vocational projects for handicapped students appeared to be much more cohesive in comparison to those for the academically disadvantged.

2. Other Than Federal and State Funds, LEAs Rarely Used Outside Information, Resources, or Expertise Prior to or During Implementation of Special Needs Projects.

Except in a few isolated cases, outside resources either in terms of information (e.g., model programs, curriculum guides, instructional materials, in-service training materials) or technical assistance were rarely used by the districts to support or guide the planning and implementation of the projects. As indicated earlier, the role of the local vocational advisory committees was passive and generally limited to formal approval and "sign-off" on the VEA package. Similarly, the role of the Department of Rehabilitation in the schools was reduced drastically with the passage of P.L. 94-142 and the priority changes with regard to eligibility for services resulting from the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the amendments of 1974.

With regard to LEA/SEA relationships, according to LEA representatives, state department of vocational education personnel seemed more concerned with issues of compliance than in providing continuing technical assistance. In states such as Florida and California, where the state agencies were divided into regions, the opportunity for technical assistance appeared to be greater than in those states not subdivided. Even then, however, because of severe personnel cuts in the state agencies (e.g., California), the opportunities for continuing state support were virtually nonexistent. Finally, in only one case was there consultation or assistance provided to the LEA from a local university. In this case, the university provided guidance in the development of an in-service training program.

3. In Effect, the VEA Set-Aside Funds for the Handicapped Were Used as an Extension of the Basic Grant.

Invariably, each LEA, regardless of its size, used the VEA basic grant to purchase new equipment and materials in an effort to maintain and upgrade its ongoing regular vocational programs. However, none of these federal funds was used by any of the school districts to maintain or improve the separate special education vocational shops. Typically, the VEA set-asides were used for this purpose. Thus, it could be argued that the use of the VEA set-asides was simply an extension of how the basic grant was used for the regular programs, not as an opportunity for providing supplementary "excess cost" services to handicapped students, as intended by the vocational legislation.

4. In General, at the LEA Level, the VEA Set-Aside Funds for Handicapped Students Were Used to Support Separate Vocational and Work Experience Programs Rather Than Supplementary Services.

Overall, the major use of the VEA set-aside funds for handicapped high school students was for the establishment of separate vocational education and work experience programs. Where districts provided separate skills programs for handicapped students, the funds were used to purchase equipment and materials. In districts that provided primarily work experience programs for handicapped students, the funds were used to pay for part of the salaries of the work coordinators.

Seldom were the VEA funds used to provide supplementary services for handicapped students enrolled in regular vocational programs. In most cases, when those services were available, they were usually supported by state and federal P.L. 94-142 funding for special education.

5. The VEA Set-Asides for Handicapped Students Usually Represented a Small Fraction of LEA's Total Budget for Special Education and Vocational Education Programs.

Except for New York City, where the VEA portion for handicapped students amounted to more than $2.5 million, the typical VEA set-aside entitlement ranged from a high of $76,000 in a large district such as Duval County, Florida to a low of $2,500 in one rural school district. In every case, including New York City, the dollar amount represented a very small fraction of the total budget the school districts allotted for special education programs and for regular vocational education programs. According to some LEA respondents, especially those in the smaller communities, the VEA special needs entitlement was not worth the administrative and paper work required to secure the funds.

Indeed, three of the five rural districts visited did not receive VEA set-aside funds for special needs populations, either because of eligibility questions or local administrative decisions not to apply for the funds. For instance, according to the vocational director at the rural site in California, the LEA, because of its size, could not simply claim its entitlement for VEA special needs funds by submitting a proposal. Rather, it had to compete for categorical funds with other distrcts of various sizes which, in most cases, had already received their share of the set-aside funds. Similarly, it appeared that the BOCES serving the rural site in New York State was not eligible for special needs funds, although it received VEA basic funds which were used to update equipment and materials for its occupational education programs.

6. Confusion Existed Regarding the Meaning of Excess Costs.

Responses to our questions about excess costs varied from "I don't know anything about that" to explanations that were typically unrelated to the provisions in the VEA. When respondents defined excess cost, they usually interpreted it as the difference between the total costs of administering a given vocational program (e.g., salaries, equipment and material costs, etc.) and the funds generated by that program through students' enrollment and participation. Thus, the interpretation focused on total program costs rather than per pupil costs, as was intended by the legislation.

7. The Need to Match Funds for the VEA Set-Aside Entitlement Rarely Created New Money for Vocational Programs for the Handicapped.

Based on responses provided by local administrators, it appeared that in some states such as Florida and Texas, the local matching requirements for VEA set-asides were met at the state level. Thus, local school districts were not required to match funds for vocational education programs for the handicapped. Alternately, when educational jurisdictions were required to match the funds from the local tax base, they appeared to do so most often by applying part of the district's tax-levy allocations earmarked for vocational education programs and personnel. Again, respondents pointed to the fact that the schools contributed from the local tax base as much as ten times more than the federal allocation and, therefore, "matching was no problem." The net effect of this strategy, however, was that additional, new local funds for vocational programs for handicapped students were seldom secured.

8. Community Colleges Utilized the VEA Set-Aside Funds to Provide Special Services to Handicapped Students Enrolled in Occupational Programs.

Unlike the LEAs, most community colleges used the VEA funds for the handicapped to provide special support-type services to disabled students rather than create separate or modified occupational programs. Of course, part of the reason may be that the handicapped student population enrolled in the college differed markedly from that found in the high schools. Few, if any, of the severely handicapped were enrolled in community college programs.

9. VEA Funds at the Community Colleges Supplemented Student Services and Programs Funded by Other District, State, and Federal Sources.

Coordination and integration of resources were emphasized at the community college level. Student services were provided through a variety of sources, including local tax revenues, state programs for the handicapped and the disadvantaged and federal Higher Education Act grants. Often, the VEA set-asides were used to supplement and target these programs and services to handicapped students enrolled in the occupational programs. A common example was the use of VEA funds to pay for part of the salaries of counselors, advisors, tutors, and aides in various student support offices so that a portion of their time could be devoted exclusively for services to the handicapped students enrolled in the occupational programs.

10. In Contrast to the LEAs, Use of External Nonfinancial Resources at the Community College was More Extensive.

With regard to special needs services for handicapped college students, the major efforts for collaboration with outside agencies consisted of exchanges between the community college and the Department of Rehabilitation. In many cases, these efforts were extended to LEAs and the nonprofit community-based organizations serving the handicapped, and in a few cases to local industry. The extent and nature of the efforts varied from participation as consultants in advisory committees to provision and exchange of direct services to students and clients.

11. Excess Cost Provisions and Matching Requirements for Vocational Education Programs in the Community Colleges Were Not Considered Relevant.

Since the VEA set-aside funds were typically used to provide supplementary special support-type services to handicapped students, most college administrators felt that they were indeed complying with the legislative mandate concerning excess costs. Despite this, however, more than a few defined excess costs as the additional funds required to supplement occupational programs that were "operating in the red." Thus, both at the LEA and the community college levels, the term appeared to create considerable confusion among vocational administrators and other key respondents.

Regarding the needs to match funds, much like the LEAs, community colleges applied funds that came from the local tax base for student services to meet the requirements in the VEA legislation. Thus, once again, the intended effects of the legislation were not achieved.

12. Resources Utilized by Community-Based Organizations Serving Handicapped Persons.

The private nonprofit community-based organizations providing services to handicapped persons typically survived by combining funds from a variety of sources, both public and private.

a. Public Sources of Funds.

One of the major sources of funds was the state Department of Rehabilitation. Although the individual financial arrangements varied, in most cases the Department of Rehabilitation contributed more than 50 percent of the agency's total budget. In some cases, the arrangement consisted of purchase agreements for services rendered to handicapped clients. In other instances, reimbursement was made on a per client, per service rendered basis.

Similar arrangements were made by a few agencies with the CETA prime sponsor for vocational screening and placement of all CETA-eligible clients, including those who were handicapped. If, on the basis of the screening, the CETA-eligible clients were placed in one of the agency's programs for the handicapped. the clients were still eligible for the appropriate CETA hourly wages.

Finally, the remedial reading and math services provided by these community-based agencies serving the handicapped were often the result of cooperative agreements between the agencies and the state and local education agencies responsible for the administration of Adult Vocational and Basic Education programs. Typically, adult education teachers and aides paid by the education agencies were assigned to the centers and provided the remedial and survival skills instructions to the handicapped clients. Additional examples of coordination of services and utilization of resources from other social service agencies in the community were limited to referral of clients for special services such as hearing aids, glasses, or mental health counseling at the community mental health centers.

b. Private Sources of Funds.

Community-based organizations supplemented their programs by actively seeking financial resources from the private sector. The most important private sector contributions were contracts with local merchants and businessmen that led to the establishment of on-the-job training and income providing programs. The handicapped clients working at the various tasks were paid for their services often, however, at less than the minimum hourly wage.

Even when specific work contracts were not available, the handicapped clients often produced a variety of novelty and decorative products that were sold by the agencies either locally or, in the case of Goodwill Industries, through its nationwide distribution centers. Other private funds for programs and services were obtained by the agencies through public sales of donated products, private donations, and charities. Finally, in some rare instances, private tuition was charged to clients who could afford it and also to those who could not meet the Department of Rehabilitation eligibility criteria for services.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS/SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS.

Issues concerning effects or consequences of vocational education programs or services for handicapped persons measured in terms of traditional indicators presented a number of difficult problems. The discussion of effects, therefore, is based primarily on the direct perceptions and judgments of respondents directly involved with vocational programs for the handicapped, as well as the logical conclusions drawn from the qualitative analysis of the interview data. There are many conclusions that can be drawn from our findings regarding consequences. The major ones are noted below.

1. VEA Special Needs Projects for Handicapped Students Had Multiple Effects on Those Involved at Different Levels.

Inevitably, projects designed to increase the vocational education opportunities for handicapped students affected others involved in the school system in addition to the students themselves. Central office administrators, principals, teachers, counselors, parents, and community members also were affected to one extent or another by the availability of VEA funds and by the design and implementation of the projects.

a. Handicapped Students Had Greater Opportunities for Vocational Education than Could Have Been Possible Without VEA Funds and Programs.

Although there were virtually no measures in existence that could be used to compare--over time--the relative effects or value of the special needs projects, it was clear that the VEA set-aside funds were being used, in conjunction with other special education funds, to provide direct vocational education services to handicapped students. Unfortunately, the majority of projects funded were designed to provide separate vocational education experiences to the disabled students rather than to provide supplementary assistance to "mainstreamed" students. Nevertheless, respondents in most cases did not perceive the choice for handicapped students to be one of separate versus regular vocational programs. Rather, the choice was seen for most handicapped students as separate skills training or no vocational opportunities, other than general work experiences. Given these conditions, it was apparent that the separate in-school vocational option would not exist unless the VEA set-aside funds were available. The costs of providing separate shops from tax-levy funds would be too high and moreover, principals would have no incentives to support such options for handicapped students.

It should be pointed out that special educators were not abandoning their efforts to encourage the placement of handicapped students into regular programs. Indeed, in several cases, the use of the categorical VEA funds was intended to support those efforts. However, special educators emphasized the need to be cautious, realistic and not to overwhelm their vocational education colleagues by insisting that all or most handicapped students interested in vocational education be placed in regular vocational classes. Thus, special educators appeared to divide their efforts; one part directed toward facilitating entry of the least handicapped students--the physically and sensory handicapped--into the regular programs, and, the other part toward providing some vocational options to the majority of the handicapped students--the minimally mentally retarded--albeit, in separate programs with generally fewer options than those offered in the regular vocational programs. Unfortunately, the learning disabled and the emotionally impaired students often were the least well served, since they were typically excluded from participating in the regular vocational programs and, in general, special programs were not available for them. Moreover, the problem for these students was exacerbated by the lack of clear definitions and criteria for identification.

b. The Availability of VEA Set-Aside Funds Led to Some Collaborative Efforts Between Special Educator and Vocational Education Administrators.

The two central office staffs most directly affected by the availability of VEA Part B set-aside funds for handicapped were the vocational and special education administrators. Based on the self-report of these respondents, in general, it appeared that the availability of funds had resulted in greater opportunities for information sharing and for better understanding of each others problems and concerns. In Duval County, Florida, for example, vocational and special educators had worked out an agreement whereby each would conduct a series of workshops for teachers. The supervisor of vocational education would provide training and information to special educators in the area of employability skills while the special education administrator would meet with vocational educators to discuss the needs of handicapped students. An important factor that seemed to limit greater collaborative planning efforts between the two staffs was the lack of specific knowledge until late in the academic year concerning what the set-aside allocation would be for the subsequent year. As a result, often projects had to be put together on an ad hoc basis without much consideration for planning in order to meet state deadlines.

Moreover, and particularly in the small districts, several administrators, principals, and teachers indicated that the paperwork involved in the application process was often a disincentive. They reported that the costs of submitting applications were greater than the amount received. On the other hand, in the larger school districts, administrators seemed more willing to accept the paperwork requirements in order to obtain the funds. In some states, such as Illinois and Texas, separate applications detailing the specifics of projects were not necessary to receive funding. The paperwork, therefore, was somewhat less for administrators. Teachers, however, were required to keep separate forms for each eligible student, specifying the nature of the handicap or disadvantagement and noting the special services provided. This process, however, caused some teacher dissatisfaction. The procedure was used by the LEAs to keep count of the number of students served and to secure reimbursement from the states. Typically, in those states there appeared to be less collaborative planning efforts at the central office level, but considerably more planning and sharing of information among staff at the individual school level.

c. The Effects on School Staff Were Mixed.

The effects of the VEA special projects on the school staff were difficult to assess, primarily because the major part of our time was spent at the district level meeting with administrators and supervisors. When we did visit the schools, the interviews with principals, teachers and counselors were more limited because of scheduling and time constraints. Nevertheless, since special educators often suggested that part of the strategy in using the VEA set-aside funds included attempts to modify the attitudes and behaviors of principals, teachers and counselors in the schools toward handicapped students, we attempted to determine to what extent this occurred.

Overall, based on the judgments of principals of schools directly involved, the separate vocational programs were "successful" in providing "realistic" options to the majority of handicapped students. Many praised the efforts of both the special education and vocational education staffs in providing assistance to organize and administer the programs efficiently. Although, typically there was considerable confusion among school staff, including principals, as to where funds were coming from, many felt that without federal support, the establishment of new vocational programs for handicapped students would not be possible. Although they considered the programs successful, many principals appeared cautious about accepting handicapped students who might not benefit from their programs. Thus, the issue of initial screening and placement seemed to be a major source of friction, especially in the larger school districts. In general, it appeared that the principals and the guidance counselors had considerable influence in determining placement. From this standpoint, the use of VEA set-aside funds to establish vocational evaluation centers could be an important and effective strategy.

Teachers in the special programs tended to be divided in their assessment of the programs. Some felt that the experiences for students were useful and would lead to salable skills, while others felt that most of the students would be placed ultimately in sheltered workshops, regardless of their skills. The attitudes of these teachers seemed to depend, to a large extent, on the quality of the district work experience programs for the handicapped students.

With regard to the regular vocational teachers interviewed, few had handicapped students in their classrooms. Of those who did, the types of disabilities the students exhibited were primarily physical or sensory. Other than for such handicapped students, most vocational teachers seemed to doubt that "mainstreaming" was a viable option. The reasons cited most often were related to shop "safety factors" and the constant need to monitor the students' classroom behaviors. Overall, it seemed very doubtful that the VEA set-aside was having much effect on these teachers' attitudes and behaviors.

d. In General, Parents and Community Members Were Not Aware of Options Related to VEA Funding.

Although we attempted to meet with at least one or two parents at each site visited, often this was not possible. Thus, our sample was relatively small and, furthermore, was limited to parents whose children were in separate vocational programs. None of the parents interviewed was aware of circumstances related to VEA special program funding or implementation. Most felt that the schools were "doing a good job," and seemed satisfied with their childrens' placement. Surprisingly, their preference seemed to be for separate vocational programs rather than for "mainstreaming."

e. Employers Were Selective in Hiring Handicapped Persons.

Our discussions with employers in the communities were much more revealing. In general, because of the EEO, affirmative action requirements, most employers were willing to hire handicapped individuals, but pointed to the fact that few were well prepared for the world of work. Indeed, such complaints were not limited to the training and competence of handicapped persons only. Many employers commented that in comparison to earlier generations of graduates, those looking for jobs today seemed to be less well prepared and willing to make the personal commitments necessary for success.

With regard to the hiring of handicapped persons, on further questioning, it seemed clear that most employers' perceptions of handicapped individuals were limited to those who were physically disabled or sensory impaired. Indeed, they seemed eager to hire such handicapped individuals as long as their specific handicaps did not interfere with the work assignments. On the other hand, when it came to hiring mentally retarded, and especially individuals with communication or emotional problems, employers were much more reluctant to do so. They seemed to fear most the "unpredictability" of these handicapped persons' behaviors and the possibility of unanticipated work disruptions in their businesses and shops. Thus, it appeared that many employers excluded arbitrarily from consideration individuals with certain types of handicaps, particularly the emotionally impaired and others with histories of unpredictable behaviors and disorders, including epilepsy and other syndromes.

2. Except for Inter-Organizational Relationships Between LEAs and Local Department of Rehabilitation, Collaborative Efforts Stimulated by VEA Special Needs Funds Were Rare.

A major interest in this study was the extent to which the set-aside provisions in the VEA facilitated the development of collaborative efforts among various groups both within LEAs and also between LEAs and outside organizations. The various attempts by school administrators and staff to collaborate and share information and resources to meet the needs of handicapped persons have been described earlier in this report.

Concerning inter-organizational arrangements, the efforts seemed to have been limited primarily to agreements with the local Department of Rehabilitation. There were exceptions, of course, such as the agreements between a number of school districts and various hospitals and other public agencies allowing for the placement of handicapped students in work study positions. Nevertheless, none of these arrangements could be traced specifically to the provisions in the vocational legislation and, moreover, none involved the use of VEA set-aside funds for the handicapped.

It appeared. therefore, that the principal VEA-based relationship consistent across sites was between the LEAs and the Department of Rehabilitation. In most cases, the agreements allowed a rehabilitation counselor access to handicapped students' school records. In other instances, as a result of state regulations, a local Department of Rehabilitation representative had to sign off on the handicapped portion of the VEA school district application prior to submission for funding to the state agency.

3. Community College Representatives Agreed That the Set-Aside Provisions of the VEA Had Increased Handicapped Students' Access to Occupational Training and Placement.

The reaction concerning the effects of the VEA categorical funds for handicapped students among community college administrators was typical. Most pointed to the beneficial effects of VEA special needs projects in terms of the improved quality of service provided to college handicapped students, although few could document outcomes quantitatively.

Nevertheless, community college representatives agreed that handicapped students' access to occupational programs had increased considerably, especially when the VEA funds could be used to supplement resource programs and special services funded with state and other federal monies for the handicapped. In isolation, the VEA special needs dollars were generally insufficient to provide direct services to students. However, as a result of collaborative planning efforts and sharing of resources, services to handicapped students could be improved significantly. In this regard, cooperative planning efforts and orchestration of resources were more evident, in general, at the community college districts than at the LEAs.

4. Among Community College Representatives, Greater Freedom in Decision-Making and Utilization of VEA Set-Aside Funds Was a Primary Objective. The Opposite Was the Case, However, at the LEA Level.

A specific recommendation suggested by several college administrators, including those administering support programs for the handicapped, was that there be greater flexibility in the utilization of VEA set-aside allocations based on self-determination of local needs as opposed to state and federal requirements. More specifically, the argument was made by many administrators that they should be able to budget their total VEA set-aside, special needs allocations for the programs and services to the designated target groups based on local needs and conditions, including the availability of other resources that may vary from year to year. Presently, administrators were restricted to programming for special needs populations based on allocations determined by state and federal formulae. As a result, in some cases, an experimental or pilot program targeted for one special needs group that lost its source of funding could not be supported with VEA funds designated for a different group. This, argued one respondent, despite the fact that the needs for continuing the program existed and that alternative state, federal or district funds were available to serve adequately the special needs of the other group. Of course, it was noteworthy that despite the eloquence of the arguments presented, none of the college administrators had used any of the VEA basic allocations to support programs and services targeted to special needs populations.

In contrast to the plea made by college representatives for greater flexibility and freedom in the use of VEA special needs funds, the opposite was generally the case at the LEA level. Except for a few vocational educators who questioned in general the effects of VEA special needs programs, central office administrators as a whole and special educators in particular were strong supporters of the categorical provisions in the VEA. In fact, for special educators in many LEAs, the availability of VEA set-aside funds had been used effectively as a lever for increasing vocational education options and opportunities for handicapped students in the high schools. Most argued that unless a specific allocation was set aside for their use, the options for handicapped students would decrease considerably since they would then have to compete with the infinite needs of other special groups and perhaps, even those of the more advantaged students.

CHAPTER SIX

LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS

A. LOCAL POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS.

1. Most Public LEAs' Policies Focused on the General Goals and Objectives of Public Education for all Students.

On the whole, it appeared that most policies and resolutions passed by local boards of education focused on LEA commitments to the total education of all students, without differentiating between advantaged and special needs populations. Even in the few instances (e.g., New York City, Oakland) where, because of recent local or federal court decisions, the local school boards needed to adopt a policy concerning the provision of bilingual education for limited-English proficiency (LEP) students, vocational education was not considered explicitly in the policy. Thus, for all but two of the LEAs visited, services to the LEP student population were guided by the general umbrella policies "to provide equal educational opportunity and to meet the needs of all students." In the remaining two districts, although the board-adopted policies referred specifically to the provisions of bilingual education for all LEP and non-English speaking students, the primary focus appeared to be on the academic rather than the vocational curricula.

2. The Relationship Between LEA Policies Concerning Vocational Education for LEP Students and State and Federal Mandates.

Whereas LEA vocational education policies for the disadvantaged and for the handicapped could be traced back to state and, in particular, federal requirements, e.g., ESEA Title I and P.L. 94-142, the relationship with regard to policies for LEP students was not so evident. Even though in every instance it was clear that LEA policies and procedures concerning programming for LEP students were influenced in fact by state and federal regulations, rarely did vocational educators suggest or perceive this relationship. Typically they viewed bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs as separate from vocational education curricula, despite the specific references in the vocational legislation recognizing the vocational needs of LEP programs.

3. In No Instance Were Vocational Educators in the LEAs Involved in Policy Formulation/Implementation of Services to LEP Students.

Of the 15 school districts visited, five (the major metropolitan cities) provided bilingual programs, four provided ESL services only, and the remainder provided individualized assistance to LEP students on an as-needed basis. In no instance, however, did vocational educators participate in the decision-making process concerning the planning, development, or administration of such programs/services to LEP students.

In most cases, vocational education programs were viewed as secondary, elective options for some students while bilingual education and ESL programs were considered transitional and were targeted primarily to LEP students in the elementary grades. As a result, neither vocational educators nor bilingual administrators perceived an immediate need for cooperative planning or administration of services. Clearly, based on observations, the provisions in the 1976 vocational legislation had had no impact on either local policy development or the nature of the relationship.

Thus, except for a small project in New York City, none of the VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged was used to provide services to LEP students. Furthermore, even in New York City, the project was neither planned nor administered with the cooperation of the bilingual office.

4. Community College Policies Were to Provide Appropriate Educational and Occupational Services for the Entire Community.

Without exception, post-secondary school administrators pointed to the service provider role of community colleges in the district. Thus, although the written policies did not distinguish selectively among special needs groups, the emphasis for program planning and development at the community colleges was in meeting the needs of all students who came to them. As a result, the emphasis on service to and programs for LEP students varied cosiderably based on the characteristics of the student population at each school. In general, however, it appeared that programs and efforts to serve the LEP students were guided more by the general community college goals and philosophies than by state or federal mandates.

5. Community-Based Organization and Advocacy Groups Influenced District Policy Primarily as a Result of Court Cases.

In those school districts where community-based organizations or advocacy groups influenced school policies, the relationships were primarily adversarial and came about as a result of litigation. Thus, for example, in New York City as a result of a consent decree, the school board in 1974 had adopted a resolution stating that all services and programs available to students in the system were to be provided to LEP students in their native language. An advisory committee was established to guide the board of education on issues relating to the court's decision. Although a number of steps had been taken to implement the policy with regard to academic offerings, according to respondents, the policy had had no impact on vocational education. Clearly, for both advocacy groups and bilingual program administrators, the priorities and the major efforts seemed to have been directed toward effecting changes in the academic offerings, primarily at the elementary and junior high school levels.

Several factors appeared to have contributed to this pattern of behavior in New York City and in the other major metropolitan cities as well. First, because of the transitional nature of most bilingual programs, the logical beginning seemed to be in the early elementary grades. Second, the cost of providing academic bilingual programs was substantially less than that of establishing separate bilingual vocational shops and programs. Moreover, parents of LEP students as well as representatives of advocacy groups still favored academic preparation for LEP students as a more desirable option than vocational education. Thus, in effect, administrative actions to date had coincided with the majority sentiments, needs, and demands of parents and other community advocates. With regard to the latter, it should be pointed out that community advocates were not against vocational preparation for students who elected such options. They feared, however, that, if the district were to provide separate bilingual shops, LEP students would automaticaly be channeled into those programs without due consideration for alternative options based on students' capabilities, preferences, and aspirations. As a result, the stress by community-based organizations concerning the provision of separate vocational education programs for LEP students had not been as strong as it might have been.

6. Federal CETA Legislation/Policy Was the Stimulus for Provision of Services to LEP Persons in the Communities.

In many urban communities with large LEP populations, CETA-sponsored programs and community-based organizations were often the principal agencies, other than the community colleges, providing language and pre-employment training to community residents. Thus, before CETA employment services were provided, LEP persons often participated in an intensive program of English as a second language. Depending on the size of the LEP population in the community, the CETA prime sponsor either funded separate community-based groups to provide such services or required each subcontractor to service a specified number of LEP persons among its CETA-eligible clients.

B. DEFINITIONS, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF THE LEP IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. At the LEA Level, Definition and Identification of LEP Students Were Based Primarily on Performance on Engligh Language and Reading Tests.

Typically, local education agencies defined LEP students on the basis of the procedures used to identify them. Moreover, the procedures varied considerably from site to site despite the fact that testing was common to all. The procedures described below were typical of all larger urban school districts that provided bilingual education and ESL instruction as well as those providing ESL instruction only. In districts providing no structured program or services to LEP students, procedures were much less formal and depended mostly on individual teacher judgments and referrals.

As a first step in the process, potential LEP students were identified at the time of registration on the basis of information obtained from parents. Such information included place of birth and languages spoken in the home. In addition, many school districts required that teachers screen their class lists for additional potential LEP students on the basis of students' surnames.

After initial identification, students were tested in a variety of English language skills including reading, grammar, and comprehension. In the majority of cases, based on their performance on such tests, students were classified as LEP and programmed into bilingual or ESL programs, depending on the availability of such programs in the district. As a rule, parental consent was necessary prior to enrollment in the programs.

The major differences in procedures among school districts were primarily related to the testing phase including (1) selection of tests (locally developed and normed versus nationally standardized), (2) administration of tests (group versus individually administered), (3) establishment of criteria and cut-off scores, (4) presence or absence of native language interviews for non-English speaking students, and (5) importance given to teachers' recommendations. Finally, it appeared that about half of the school districts followed the procedures of administering to some of the LEP students who had failed the English language test a comparable primary language test to determine language dominance and to examine whether the observed differences in performance were due to linguistic factors.

2. **Some Confusion Existed Over Definitions Resulting from Identification Procedures.**

Essentially, LEP students were defined as those whose native language was other than English and who had failed to achieve a certain level of linguistic proficiency on standardized English tests. Few school districts attempted to determine whether such failures were due to linguistic factors or some other home- or school-related factors. Thus, as a general rule, LEP students identified as a result of the process described above were programmed automatically into bilingual or ESL programs, when, in some cases, other reading or language arts programs for the academically or economically disadvantaged might have been more appropriate. Unfortunately, the inclusion of a high percentage of academically disadvantaged students in bilingual programs had led to the perception among many in the schools and community that bilingual programs were equivalent to compensatory or remedial education strategies for LEP students. These perceptions were reinforced in many instances by the fact that students were selected on the basis of "failure" on a test and also by the transitional nature of the bilingual programs; that is, LEP students participated in the programs for a few years during the early grades until, gradually, they could be phased into the English monolingual curricula and compete on an equal footing with their native English-speaking peers.

3. **In Most Cases, the Identification of LEP Students Was Done in the Schools But Was Coordinated by the Central Bilingual Education Office With No Input from Vocational Educators.**

In each of the five metropolitan school districts visited, a supervisor had been appointed to coordinate all bilingual and ESL activities for LEP students. A major responsibility of the bilingual office (working sometimes with the testing office) and one that often took considerable time, was the establishment and administration of procedures to identify the LEP student population. Because most bilingual plans called for elementary grade and junior high school instruction only (New York City was the exception), vocational educators, as a rule, were not involved in the identification process. Indeed, the extent to which other educators participated in the process varied as well. Classroom teacher recommendations about individual placement appeared to be more valued by the central office staff in mid-size communities than in the large urban centers.

4. Procedures for Placing LEP Students in Vocational Education Classes/Programs Were the Same as Those for Other Students.

Since in most cases, except for some ESL classes, the LEAs were not providing any special bilingual services to LEP high school students, the placement procedures in vocational education classes or programs were the same as those for all students. That is, by Grade 10 students declared an interest in enrolling in the vocational programs through the guidance departments. Admission into regular vocational programs then depended on each student's ability to meet the academic and language requirements. Often the final decisions were made by guidance counselors and vocational education teachers after reviewing and screening the applications of all interested students for each of the vocational offerings. If a student was rejected from a particular course offering, the guidance counselor would suggest alternative programs in which the demand was not as great.

In general, researchers rarely found instances where LEAs made special efforts to recruit or encourage placement of LEP students in the regular vocational programs. In fact, the opposite may have been the case since vocational education teachers considered the ability to speak and understand English fluently critical for success in their classes. Thus, as a general rule, they rejected applications from students who could not meet basic language requirements. Teachers and guidance counselors indicated, however, that few students were excluded from vocational education because of the language criterion only. According to respondents, by the time LEP students entered high school, most were proficient in English.

5. The Availability of Bilingual Programs at the Secondary Level Tended to Restrict LEP Students' Access to Vocational Education Programs.

New York City was the only LEA visited offering academic bilingual education programs for identified LEP at the secondary level. Unfortunately, all of these programs, funded primarily with ESEA Title VII, Title I and state moneys, were placed in various comprehensive high schools throughout the city. None existed in any of the city's 22 vocational high schools.

Paradoxically, the existence of these programs limited access to vocational education programs. Because special bilingual instruction, counseling, and ESL services were available at the secondary level, guidance counselors generally recommended and channeled the entering high school students to those schools that offered the programs and thus could best meet their language needs. As a result, LEP students access to vocational programs was limited to the occupational course offerings available in those comprehensive schools. In comparison to the range of programs available to students in the vocational schools, the vocational options for the LEP students in the comprehensive schools were quite limited.

6. Very Few LEP Students Were Participating in Vocational Education Programs.

In spite of the fact that in many of the LEAs visited, a large proportion of the student population was Hispanic or Asian American, few LEP students were participating in the regular vocational education programs. Based on discussions with school personnel as well as with representatives from community-based organizations, two possible conflicting factors may account for this observation.

First, according to LEA respondents, particularly vocational educators and supervisors, the number of LEP students enrolled in vocational programs was relatively small because the total high school enrollment of LEP students was small. The argument presented most often was that, by the time LEP students reached high school and were eligible for vocational education, they had achieved proficiency in the English language and, therefore, were no longer categorized as LEP.

On the other hand, community advocates, although agreeing with the observation that LEP enrollment in high schools was small, disagreed with the reason suggested by LEA personnel. The counter argument made was that, because the school districts were no longer providing special bilingual instruction and counseling services in the high schools, most LEP students experiencing academic failure and frustrations tended to drop out of school during their sophomore and junior years.

According to these community respondents, students who had dropped out of the school system represented a substantial proportion of their CETA-eligible clients needing ESL as well as basic skills instruction and pre-employment training. Unfortunately, school dropout figures, categorized by special needs population as well as CETA client data, were very difficult to obtain, and neither hypothesis could be confirmed.

7. At the Community College Level, LEP Students Were Identified Initially Upon Entrance and Also Through Teacher Referrals.

In cases where the community college enrollment of LEP students was relatively high, identification of students and assessment of their needs were made immediately upon entrance. Often, all students regardless of language background were required to take an English reading and writing test, usually developed locally by the English department, before they were enrolled in regular academic or occupational programs. On the basis of the students' performance as well as reviews of school records, a recommendation was made by the college advisor for placement in either regular classes, basic skills remediation classes, or ESL classes. The nature of the ESL program varied considerably depending on the size of the LEP population and its needs. Thus, in some cases, the ESL program consisted of a single non-credit class providing intensive instruction to a few students until they could function effectively in the regular school programs. On the other hand, particularly in California, ESL programs offered a sequence of courses for LEP students comparable to the regular English sequence for other students. Upon successful completion of the course sequence, LEP students received appropriate credits toward the Associate Degree.

Typically, LEP students had to complete successfully at least one semester of the ESL sequence before enrolling in occupational programs. Except for this requirement, placement procedures for LEP students in vocational/occupational programs were the same as those for all other students, that is, personal interest to enroll in a given program and evidence of ability to meet the criteria for entrance. Often, an LEP student enrolled in an occupational program but experiencing language difficulties would be identified and referred by the teacher for individualized support services including assignment of a bilingual peer tutor.

8. CETA-Funded Community-Based Organizations Recruited LEP Persons Needing Training and Employment Services.

In six of the 15 communities visited, researchers were able to identify community-based organizations funded by CETA for the purpose of assisting LEP persons. Typically, LEP persons were recruited as a result of direct media campaigns as well through a network of referrals from other CBOs and the Department of Employment. In most cases, CETA income eligibility for the clients referred had already been determined by the appropriate agency. Placement into the various programs, including ESL, was determined by the CBO on the basis of an intake interview and, in some cases, language testing.

In communities where the LEP population was relatively small, although separate community-based organizations could not be identified, each

CETA-funded program was required to identify and to serve LEP individuals. Most often, when LEP persons were identified as eligible for CETA services, they were referred to the community college for ESL instructions as part of their preemployment training.

C. PLANNING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS.

1. At the LEA Level, the Absence of Planning Activities for Vocational Programs for LEP Students Was Notable Across Sites.

There were virtually no planning activities at the local level related to vocational education programming for LEP students. Except for a small project in New York City, none of the LEAs receiving VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged targeted the funds for special programs or support services for LEP students. According to respondents, two factors seemed to account for the absence of planning for and services to LEP students. First, there was no need for such special services since the LEP student population in the high schools was relatively small. Second, in each district, the size of the disadvantaged population was so large that the federal set-aside funds were barely sufficient to provide services to meet some of its needs. In effect, then, based on the priorites determined by almost all local educational personnel, all of the VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged were used to support programs and services for the disadvantaged. in particular, the academically disadvantaged.

2. The Role of the Advisory Committee Was Limited and, in Most Cases, LEP Representation Was Lacking.

Although, in many cases, the local advisory councils for vocational education (LACVEs) and the individual craft committees influenced considerably the direction and focus of the overall vocational programs in the LEAs, their role vis-a-vis special needs vocational programs and services was generally passive and reactive. Part of the problem was due to the fact that representation on these committees rarely included an advocate for the special needs populations. Occasionally, someone representing the interests of the disadvantaged or the handicapped could be found among LACVE members, but, in each of the sites visited, none was identified as an advocate for LEP students. As a result, school personnel generally had no difficulty justifying the observed pattern with regard to the use of VEA set-aside funds.

3. Academic Bilingual Education Programs and ESL Programs Were Planned and Administered by Bilingual Educators Who Did Not Interact at All With Vocational Educators.

In all but one of the sites visited, bilingual programs were limited to the elementary and middle grades. Moreover, all bilingual programs were primarily academic and transitional. That is, the primary objectives were to teach academic subjects--reading, math, history, science--to LEP students in their native language while they learned English sufficiently well to switch to an all-Engligh program. It was, therefore, not surprising that vocational educators would not be involved directly in the planning of such programs.

Nonetheless, researchers found that, even when the LEA offered bilingual high school programs and, moreover, even when a percentage of VEA set-aside funds was used for services to LEP students, interactions between bilingual and vocational staff were absent. In Oakland, San Antonio, and New York, bilingual administrators indicated that, although some preliminary attempts at co-planning had been made, their efforts had not been successful. Respondents suggested that vocational education for LEP students was clearly not a priority issue. For their part, vocational administrators suggested that, given the limited resources available and the lack of trained bilingual shop teachers, "the concept of bilingual vocational education was impracticable, despite court or federal mandates requiring the provision of such services."

4. At the Community College, Planning for LEP Students Varied Depending on the Types of Services Provided.

Essentially, two major program strategies were identified with regard to services for community college enrolled LEP students--an academic ESL strategy and a vocational ESL/bilingual strategy. The first was the strategy used most often by the community colleges while the latter was observed only in California community colleges and represented initial or pilot attempts to serve LEP students. The most extensive academic ESL programs were also found in California. Thus, planning activities at the community college level varied considerably depending on which programs and strategies were used to provide services to LEP students.

a. Planning for Academic ESL Programs Was Done Primarily by English Departments with Little or No Involvement by the Occupational Staff.

Often, for the more extensive ESL programs such as those observed in Holtville and Modesto, California, and also in New York City, planning and coordination were done by an ESL director within the English Language Division. The curriculum, divided into a two- or three-semester sequence, was correlated to the regular English course requirements, and there were few attempts at coordination between the ESL and English Division faculty and the vocational/technical faculty.

In Holtville (Imperial County College), initial efforts to coordinate the language skills and vocabulary related to occupational training within the ESL curriculum failed partly because of interdepartmental conflicts concerning program ownership and funding. In Modesto, efforts by the vocational/occupational staff were ongoing to identify, through task analyses, the language competencies necessary for success in some of the occupational programs. The staff then planned to present the results of these efforts to the ESL and Language Arts Division staff for possible inclusion within the ESL curriculum. Vocational educators were hopeful that such a linkage between ESL and vocational/occupational education could be established. leading to better preparation of LEP students electing vocational training.

b. Planning for Vocational ESL/Bilingual Strategies Was Done Primarily by the Vocational/Technical Staff.

A few community colleges, primarily those in California, provided supplementary support VEA set-aside services to LEP students enrolled in vocational/occupational programs. In general, planning for such services was conducted by the Dean of the Occupational Division after meeting with his faculty to discuss the needs of LEP students enrolled in the various programs. Such division level meetings took place regularly in an attempt to identify the needs and requests made by the various chairpersons and to develop the plans for the use of all categories of VEA funds. The plans were then incorporated into the VEA application and submitted to the various vocational education advisory committees and the college president for final approval.

c. Community Impact and Outside Involvement in the Planning Process for Either Strategy Was Very Limited.

Except for the requirement that the Vocational Education Advisory Council sign off on the VEA application, there was no apparent involvement by community groups or advocates in planning for services to LEP students. This appeared to be the case for both ESL instructions provided to all college-enrolled LEP students and supplementary support services targeted to those enrolled in occupational programs only.

In comparison to planning for services and programs for other special needs groups, outside involvement and participation were more likely for the handicapped and, to a more limited extent, for the disadvantaged than for services to LEP students. Part of the reason may be that there were more external community organizations and groups providing services to handicapped and disadvantaged persons than to LEP persons.

5. Community-Based Organizations Serving LEP Populations Planned Programs Independently in Response to CETA Prime Sponsor Request for Proposals.

Even though each agency planned its programs independently, the extent of planning and the relations and interactions between the agency and the prime sponsor varied from site to site. In several cases, e.g., Texas and California, the CBOs participated in the city or county-wide Employment/Training Advisory Councils prior to the release of RFPs by the prime sponsor and, therefore, were aware of the specific CETA planning requirements. As a result, some of the organizations had established extensive planning procedures at the program level based on market analyses and review of current needs of both clients and employers in the community. Moreover, some agencies such as SER (Service Employment and Redevelopment) received considerable technical assistance in the planning and program development process from the national SER organization.

On the other hand, other small CBOs serving Asian, Indo-Chinese and Pacific Americans, particularly in the Oakland area, lacked the capabilities for extensive planning. Nevertheless, these agencies appeared to provide a much needed service for their respective clients, recent immigrants, in the community. The one exception was in New York City where the China Institute, a private nonprofit organization, was administering a national Section J, VEA discretionary fund bilingual occupational program to train newly arrived Chinese immigrants as chefs. The Institute, beginning as early as 1975, had established an Industry Advisory Council and had conducted extensive assessments to determine needs in the food industry. Advice was solicited by the program staff from more than 1,300 food establishments in the greater New York area.

D. STRATEGIES FOR SERVING THE LIMITED-ENGLISH PROFICIENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. There Were No Vocational Education Strategies Found in the LEAs to Meet the Special Needs of LEP Students.

In keeping with general LEA policies that bilingual education and ESL be provided to LEP students in the elementary and middle grades to promote academic development while the students learned English well enough to follow the English curriculum, little or no effort was made by the LEAs to provide special services to LEP students in the high schools. Of the 15 sites visited, only one provided secondary academic bilingual education; most other LEAs met the needs of entering LEP high school students by providing either intensive ESL instructions (e.g., 8-week Defense Language Institute Program 2 to 3 hours per day) or traditional ESL programs using itinerant teachers and providing instruction for part of the day.

Virtually none of the school districts had either developed a bilingual or ESL vocational education strategy or established supplementary support programs for LEP students enrolled in regular vocational education. Moreover, none of the districts had implemented or considered strategies to provide indirect services to LEP students such as (1) increasing LEP representation in vocational education programs through more effective testing and assessment of LEP students' vocational interests and capabilities, (2) modifying or developing curriculum materials appropriate for LEP students in vocational education programs, (3) providing staff development or training for vocational teachers, or (4) providing bilingual aides in the vocational class.

In sum, researchers found virtually no strategies or activities at the LEA level in support of programs or services for LEP students in vocational education programs. The only exception was a small separate VEA special needs project operated by the Center for Career and Occupational Education in New York City. This program, serving approximately 150 students, was designed to assist LEP students in acquiring a range of job skills while they also learned English language skills. Participating students could earn credits toward their high school diploma and could transfer into regular vocational programs at the comprehensive high schools as they gained proficiency in English.

2. By the Time LEP Students Entered High School, They Were No Longer Considered LEP and, Therefore, Were Expected to Compete for Vocational Options Available to All Students, the Advantaged and the Disadvantaged.

In general, school personnel, academic and vocational educators, assumed that entering high school students who had participated in bilingual programs in the elementary and middle grades learned English well enough to participate in regular high school programs. Thus, for the majority of these students, the vocational options and requirements were the same as for those whose native language was English. Rarely were exceptions made because of the language factors either in terms of criteria for placement in vocational programs or for services provided after placement.

While special considerations due to linguistic factors were not made, often "former" LEP students, because of poor performance on academic achievement tests, qualified for special needs vocational education options. Unfortunately, the options for academically disadvantaged students, in general, tended to be limited to placement in remedial basic skills programs or alternative vocational education and work study programs that provided fewer opportunities for the better paying jobs.

The categorization of "former" LEP students as academically disadvantaged sometimes created conflicts between the local educational agencies and the disadvantaged and minority community. On the one hand, some bilingual educators and community advocates argued that the categorization and tracking of language minority students, even those proficient in English, as disadvantaged on the basis of performance in English achievement and reading tests were both inappropriate and discriminatory. Conversely, often students enrolled in bilingual programs had been excluded from district-wide achievement testing. Thus, in many instances achievement data were missing, and students who would otherwise be eligible for special needs services for the academically disadvantaged were excluded from such programs. Finally, based on the enrollment data of special needs projects and on conversations with LEA and community respondents, disadvantagement in some cases seemed to be correlated with race and, often, language minority students tended to be excluded from such programs.

3. Vocational Education and Bilingual Education Programs at the LEAs Were Totally Separate, and No Efforts Were Made to Coordinate Strategies, Resources, or Programs.

A prerequisite to coordination of strategies, resources, or programs is collaborative planning and discussion of issues and priorities. Without exception, in none of the LEAs visited had the Central Office Vocational Education and Bilingual Education staff met to discuss their respective programs and, perhaps, identify areas of mutual interests.

In general, vocational educators were most concerned with the status and effectiveness of the general vocational education programs. Special needs projects were clearly secondary in their order of priorities. On the other hand. bilingual educators, often new in their administrative positions, were primarily concerned with the institutionalization of academic bilingual programs in the schools. Although many of the programs existed in the elementary schools, their financial base was "soft," dependent on state and federal, ESEA Title VII grants. Thus, not surprisingly, the major issue of concern for bilingual educators appeared to be the mobilization of resources and community support for effecting bilingual program transition to tax-levy funds when the federal grants terminated. Expanding bilingual education to secondary vocational programs was not an effort they seemed willing to undertake at the present time without the full support and backing of the community, the school boards, the superintendents and their key deputies.

4. In Small and Rural Communities, LEAs Placed Emphasis on Individualized Instruction.

Several of the rural and mid-size communities visited had no ESL or bilingual programs for LEP students. It appeared that the small number of LEP students enrolled in the schools did not warrant such programs. Nevertheless, respondents pointed to occasions when non-English speaking families with school-aged children moved into the community and services had to be provided. In such cases, as for all special needs populations, including the academically disadvantaged, individual teachers were expected to assist the students on a personal basis and to make appropriate curricular modifications. Often, a peer or older student familiar with the native language of the LEP child would be asked to provide assistance as well. In general, in these sites, both planning and programming were much less formal and individual teachers had considerably more flexibility than their colleagues in the more urban school districts.

5. At the Community Colleges, the Common Strategy for Serving all LEP Students Was ESL Instructions and Emphasis was on Individualized Instruction.

The most consistent pattern of service delivery to all LEP college enrolled students, including those in occupational programs, was ESL instructions. Typically, students were identified at the time of admission and were programmed for ESL instruction. In some cases, the students would apply the ESL credits toward the language requirement for the Associate degree; in all instances however, LEP students had to demonstrate proficiency in English before participating in the occupational programs.

The ESL curriculum was developed by the language arts division, and as indicated earlier, except in one case, was unrelated to the occupational curricula. None of the VEA set-aside funds was used to support these "academic" ESL programs.

In addition to the structured ESL courses, students experiencing language difficulties in general academic and vocational classes were often referred by instructors to the library, media center or guidance office for individualized assistance. The nature of the assistance varied and included the assignment of bilingual peer tutors, often working at the centers as part of the school's work study programs, small group instruction and, in Florida, programmed instruction at the Individualized Manpower Training System Centers.

6. In California, Community Colleges Sought to Provide Supplementary Support Services to LEP Students Enrolled in Occupational Programs.

Community colleges in California were unique in the sense that administrators were able to identify specifically services provided to LEP students funded through VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged. The strategies used have been identified in this report as "vocational" in contrast to the academic ESL strategies discussed earlier. In each case, the efforts were very modest and the activities had been implemented within the past year. The range of activities is presented below.

a. Linking the ESL Curriculum to Language Skills Critical in Occupational Programs.

Vocational administrators and faculty members at the Modesto Junior College were attempting to identify through task analyses the common language skills necessary for success in several occupational offerings available to college enrolled students. Although the task had not yet been completed, respondents at the college planned to approach the ESL faculty and discuss the possibilities of modifying the ESL curriculum to reflect the outcomes of the project.

b. Using Bilingual Aides for Individualized and Small Group Instructions to LEP Students in Occupational Programs.

Providing bilingual aides in the occupational shops during and after regularly scheduled hours was a strategy adopted by each of the three community colleges in California. The aides worked with the LEP students individually and in small groups, depending on the needs of the students and those of the instructors.

c. Translating, Modifying and Developing Curriculum Materials for LEP Students in Occupational Programs.

Both the Peralta Community College District in Oakland and the Imperial County College in Holtville, California, adopted the strategy of translating curriculum materials into Spanish* for courses in Welding and Auto Mechanics. Furthermore, the projects included the development of visual slides and audio cassettes to be used simultaneously. The materials could be used both as part of the curriculum in class or kept at the media centers for independent review by the LEP students whenever necessary.

d. Using Bilingual Shop Instructors to Provide Occupational Training to LEP Students.

Imperial County College in Holtville, California, was the only postsecondary institution providing bilingual vocational education. A part-time instructor was hired with VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged to teach two sections of auto mechanics to LEP students. The majority of the students participating were non-degree students, interested primarily in learning the entry-level skills and then finding employment. Nonetheless, if a student was interested in pursuing further training, that option was available as long as the academic and language requirements could be met.

7. Rarely did Community Colleges Effect Strategies for Service to LEP Students Involving External Community Organizations.

The only ties with community agencies involving services to LEP persons were with the CETA prime sponsor and its CETA-funded CBOs. The relationship was usually that of ESL service provider for some of the CETA eligible clients. Virtually none of the community colleges worked cooperatively with the community agencies in an effort to provide collaborative training or services to LEP adult populations.

The only exception was the Imperial Valley College in California that was collaborating with the County Migrant Education Office and a community-based agency funded to provide social and welfare services to migrant families. In this case, the college, as a result of a federal Higher Education Act grant, provided ESL instruction to migrant workers in various satellite areas in remote parts of the county. The relationship however, involved the ESL, Language Arts Division in the college, not the Occupational Division.

---

*/ In Holtsville, the local Mexican dialect was used to translate the curriculum materials.

8. **Community-based Organizations, Primarily CETA Sponsored Programs, Provided ESL Instructions as Part of Their Employment/Training Programs.**

In many of the large urban communities and some of the mid-size cities visited, CETA Title II and Title VI funded community-based, non-profit organizations were established to provide language and employment training to LEP adult populations. The majority of the community-based organizations such as SER in Texas, Casa de la Raza and Camposinos Unidos in California provided services to Hispanic LEP persons. In New York City, Chicago and particularly in Oakland, however, researchers found a number of separate organizations providing services to other LEP populations, mostly recent immigrants from countries in Asia and Indochina including Korea, Japan, Vietnam, China and the Phillipine Islands.

Typically, these agencies provided to their clients ESL instructions as well as prevocational training or, as put by one respondent, "survival vocational English." Such services included counseling and, for those who needed it, preparation for the General Education Development (GED) credentials. In general, except for typing or clerical skills, vocational training was not provided. Clients who were eligible for such training were referred to a CETA funded skills Training Center, often operated by the community college. Referrals occurred however, after the clients could meet the specific language and academic requirements. In most cases, the skills centers did not provide special language support services to the LEP clients.

The ESL programs operated by these CBOs ranged from beginning levels to advanced. In some cases, the teachers employed by the agencies were selected, hired and paid with program funds. In other instances however, the teachers were assigned to the agencies by the LEAs through the Adult Basic Education Programs supported by state and CETA funds.

9. **One Community-Based Organization, the China Institute in New York City, Provided Its Clients Bilingual Occupational Training in Addition to Survival English Skills.**

In most cases, community-based CETA-supported organizations serving LEP populations provided ESL instructions, prevocational training and employment services to their clients. Typically, occupational training was provided to the LEP clients in English by other agencies, mostly skills centers supported by CETA and administered by the local community colleges. Rarely did researchers find a CBO that provided bilingual occupational training to LEP clients. The only exception was the China Institute in New York City that trained newly-arrived immigrants to become Chinese chefs.

This program was established as a result of a national VEA competitive grant awarded to the Institute. The training consisted of both short-term instruction in the art of Chinese food preparation at the training site and placement on an apprenticeship position at one of the more than 50 field sites in the greater New York City area. The occupational instructions in the shop were given in Chinese but clients participated also in ESL classes focusing primarily on the survival English skills needed to negotiate their basic needs. In addition to the education services, the Institute provided to its clients a variety of social services such as counseling, housing and health care.

According to respondents at the Institute, the program had been very successful in placing its graduates. Over 97 percent of those who had been trained were presently employed at entry level positions in a variety of food establishments. The issues of stereotyping the population or possibly limiting clients' access to other occupations as a result of participation in the program did not seem to concern the staff. Respondents suggested that most of their clients, in addition to having no English language skills had no previous occupational training. Thus, it was most important to train them quickly for placement in occupations with high potential for employment that did not require extensive English language training.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR LEP PERSONS.

1. Except for a Single Case, VEA Set-Aside Funds for Disadvantaged Students Were Not Used by LEAs to Provide Services to LEP Students.

Within the framework of the disadvantaged provisions, the VEA specified that a proportional amount of the set-aside funds for disadvantaged persons be used by LEAs for appropriate vocational education programs for LEP high school students. Based on our discussions and observations in 15 separate LEAs across the nation, virtually none programmed the VEA funds to provide such services to LEP student populations.

Except for New York City, all other LEAs utilized the entire set-aside allocations for services and programs targeted for the disadvantaged, primarily the academically disadvantaged. Two reasons were suggested by LEA respondents: (1) the costs for providing bilingual vocational education programs were very high, exceeding the federal set-aside allocations for such purposes and (2) the local needs and priorities for such services did not match those implied by the legislation since most language minority students knew English well enough to succeed in regular programs by the time they entered high school. In support of this argument, some LEA respondents in San Antonio, Chicago, Oakland and Jacksonville noted that the majority of the Hispanic populations in the communities and the schools was firmly established and non-transient. Therefore, most had acquired the English language skills to compete successfully with their native English speaking peers. In this regard, Holtville and Modesto, California, were two of the communities visited that had the largest migrant populations. The former did not apply or receive VEA set-aside funds while the latter utilized its set-aside allocation to provide remedial English and math skills to academically disadvantaged students. In Modesto, ESL instructions were provided to LEP students using local tax-levy funds.

2. There Were Few Attempts at the LEA Level to Coordinate Resources - Information, Materials, People and Dollars - in the Provision of Vocational Education Service to LEP Students.

Despite the fact that all LEAs in the major metropolitan cities visited, administered some bilingual programs funded by ESEA Title VII, researchers could rarely document any efforts on the part of bilingual and vocational administrators to collaborate and coordinate resources to provide services benefiting LEP students enrolled in vocational education programs. Preliminary attempts to coordinate efforts in San Antonio had resulted in the development of a joint proposal for a bilingual vocational program in the district. The proposal had been submitted for national VEA discretionary funding but, unfortunately, the award was not made. In general, the lack of collaborative efforts in the utilization of resources at the LEA level extended to outside agencies as well.

3. Issues Regarding Provisions of "Excess Costs" and "Matching Funds" Were Not Relevant Given Our Findings Concerning LEA Vocational Education Services for LEP Students.

The issues concerning the provisions of excess costs and the needs to match funds for set aside programs for the disadvantaged have been discussed elsewhere in this report under the Resource Utilization Sections for the disadvantaged. What was most striking however, was the lack of knowledge among bilingual educators and administrators in LEAs regarding the provisions concerning LEP students in the vocational legislation. Many expressed surprise and interest at the nature of our questions. Few, however, suggested that the legislation would have any measurable impact on the relationship with their vocational education colleagues.

4. Community Colleges in California and New York City Only Applied a Portion of the VEA Set-Aside Finds for Disadvantaged to Programs for LEP Students.

Although efforts were made by researchers to determine the community colleges' budget for each of the VEA subparts, only in California were we able to document specific allocations targeted to LEP students. Not surprisingly, these were also the only sites where "vocational" LEP strategies and programs were implemented. Unfortunately, however, the specific allocations were exceedingly small, ranging from $5,800 for the Peralta Community College District consisting of five separate colleges in Oakland, California, to $22,700 for the Imperial Valley College in Holtville, California, that has a student enrollment of approximately 4,500 students, of which 60 percent were Hispanic. Considering the apparent needs and the resources available, college administrators were very disheartened with the services they could provide. Moreover, some felt that the efforts and the costs associated with submitting the application for the VEA funds were in fact, greater than their allocations.

5. Colleges Applying a Portion of the Set-Asides for LEP Students Were Using the Funds for Excess Cost Services and Matched the Funds with Tax-Levy Follars Used for Ongoing Programs.

In California, where community colleges specifically targeted a portion of the VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged to LEP populations enrolled in vocational programs, the services provided were clearly supplementary and were designed to enhance LEP students' success in vocational training. With regard to the matching of funds however, in most cases, administrators applied community college district funds budgeted by the school for the administration of its ongoing occupational and ESL programs. Thus, the matching of funds was essentially a bookkeeping procedure to satisfy the requirements of the legislation without, in fact, increasing the pot of money available for programming.

6. Community Colleges Used Other Sources of Funds to Provide ESL Instructions to All LEP Students.

Although few community colleges provided vocational supplementary services to LEP students participating in occupational training, almost all provided some form of "academic" ESL training. In general, these ESL services were funded with community college district funds on the basis of the student enrollment and participation in such courses (ADA, FTE). Occasionally, where the need for ESL instructions in the community was great, services were provided by the colleges to community residents in various satellite locations in the district. As in the case of some of the colleges in California, these satellite ESL programs were supported by federal Higher Education Act grants.

7. Community-Based Organizations Serving LEP Adult Populations Received Most of Their Funding from CETA and Were Not Involved in the Use of VEA Funds.

As indicated, community-based agencies providing language and employment training to LEP populations in the communities were funded by CETA as a result of competitive awards in response to RFPs. Rarely were researchers able to identify instances of VEA resource sharing between the CBOs and either the community colleges or the LEAs.

In the case of some LEAs, cooperative efforts were limited to arrangements with the CBOs for the assignment of adult basic education teachers for ESL and basic skills instructions. In the case of some community colleges, financial agreements existed with certain CBOs allowing the agencies to refer its LEP CETA-eligible clients for ESL instruction at the college.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS/SERVICES ON LEP PERSONS.

1. The Provisions Concerning Vocational Services to LEP Students in the VEA Have Had Minimal Impact at the LEA Level.

In discussing the effects of VEA special needs projects, LEA personnel. in general pointed to the variety of services and activities purchased with VEA funds and targeted to the special needs groups. Moreover, as was often the case, respondents argued that the special services/activities could not have been provided without the availability of the VEA special needs categorical grants. Thus, effects were discussed most often by respondents in terms of additional services, activities and materials that could be made available to the students. Rarely. however, did respondents consider or discuss effects in terms of outcomes or changes in behaviors on the part of all those involved, including those of the special needs students.

With regard to effects on LEP high school students, however, irrespective of the criteria used, based on our observations and findings, it can be said that the 1976 provisions in the VEA concerning this special needs group have had no measurable impact either on the behaviors of those involved at the LEAs or on the vocational options, opportunities and services provided to LEP high school students. While this may appear to be a strong conclusion, nevertheless, it seems irrefutable based on analyses of the interview data with school personnel in 15 LEAs across the nation.

2. The Availability of VEA Set-Aside Funds for Vocational Services to LEP Students Did Not Stimulate Collaborative Planning or Sharing of Resources Within LEAs.

Because of differences in program priorities between vocational education and bilingual education, administrators rarely met to plan and to discuss collaborative program options. Bilingual administrators tended to be most concerned with the development and institutionalization of academic bilingual programs, beginning first in the elementary grades and progressing incrementally to the secondary grades. In the one LEA that offered high school bilingual programs, participation in such classes often precluded the ability of the LEP students to participate in the regular vocational programs, especially those in the vocational high schools.

3. Few LEP High School Students Participated in Vocational Educational Programs.

Since most LEAs did not provide bilingual education at the secondary school level, the efforts to identify LEP high school students were considerably less formal and precise than those used to identify elementary age children (New York City was the exception). Often, administrators simply assumed that entering high school LEP students who had participated earlier in the district's bilingual programs were ready to follow the English monolingual curriculum. As a result, enrollments of LEP students in the high schools tended to be very small. If these "former" LEP students were experiencing difficulty in their classes, they were categorized as academically disadvantaged or, as suggested by some community advocates, they dropped out of the system. In any event, the LEAs rarely pursued assessment efforts to determine whether the difficulties were related to linguistic, environmental, or cognitive factors.

4. At the LEA Level, School Personnel, Especially Vocational Educators, Often Included Language Proficiency as a Criterion for Defining Academic Disadvantagement.

Given the lack of precise assessment measures and the resulting confusion concerning definitions, it would be predictable that few LEP students would be participating in vocational programs. If students could meet the academic and language requirements and wanted to participate in the regular vocational programs, they could do so; but yet, would not be categorized as LEP students. If, on the other hand, they could not meet the entrance criteria, they were excluded from the regular vocational programs. As alternatives, the options were few: placement in general courses with assignment to remedial basic skills classes and ESL instruction, placement in separate but more limited vocational programs for the academically disadvantaged or perhaps, as some suggested, dropping out of school completely.

5. The Most Visible Effects of the VEA With Regard to LEP Students Was at the Community College District Level.

A central finding of the study was the apparent, and often successful, efforts made by the community colleges to meet the particular needs of special populations. The overwhelming desire to serve the community, coupled with the ability to plan and orchestrate resources, both internal and external, more than any other factor, have led to success in acceptance and implementation of programs and activities for special needs populations. The strategies adopted by the California community colleges in particular with regard to supplementary support for LEP students were examples of such service and demonstrated that, despite the lack of funds, small but innovative projects could be designed to meet the special needs of some LEP students.

Unfortunately, however, with regard to LEP students, each college faculty tended to operate independently without much awareness of efforts made by neighboring institutions or by those across the state or the nation. Rarely was outside expertise from the State sgencies or other universities used as a resource in the planning and development of the special needs projects for LEP students. In most cases as well, the absence of collaborative efforts extended to relationships with community-based organizations serving the LEP adult special needs population.

6. The Primary Effort at the Community College Was to Provide ESL Instructions to All LEP Students.

Since all academic and technical/vocational college programs leading to Associate degrees required that students be proficient in English and, moreover, since employers generally demanded that employees speak and understand English, community college administrators have devoted their major efforts to intensive ESL programs for the LEP students. The efforts, however, were independent of the provisions in the VEA and had been ongoing even prior to the 1976 legislation. According to respondents, the primary stimulus leading to the development of such programs was the increased enrollment of LEP students in community colleges and the realization that special services were needed to serve this special population adequately. Despite the community college's efforts, however, respondents noted that the dropout rate for LEP students, particularly LEP women who tended to be less assertive, was higher than the average rate. Respondents noted further that two major factors seemed to account for this pattern of behavior. First, many of the LEP students, in addition to needing English language skills, tended to lack the minimum academic competencies required for participation in the various college programs. Thus, often remedial classes needed to be programmed as well. Second, because of their reluctance to seek help, LEP students seemed less likely to take full advantage of the multiple student support services available to all students at the colleges. As a result, many of the LEP students became discouraged, dropped out, and sought help at the community-based agencies that were funded specifically to serve their needs.

7. Community College Vocational Administrators Claimed That Restrictions on the Utilization of VEA Set-Aside Funds Limited Programming for LEP Students.

Ideally, many vocational administrators, especially those in California, felt that programming for special needs populations and the corresponding allocation of the VEA categorical funds should be based on local needs assessments rather than predetermined state and federal formulae. Perhaps the most telling example was that of a Vocational Dean in California who complained that despite the fact that over 60 percent of the students in the school were Hispanic, the VEA allocation for LEP students was less than the allocation for handicapped students who represented a very small group in the college. Whereas he had difficulty programming the funds for the handicapped, especially since the state already provided substantial additional resources for this special needs population, he could barely meet the special needs of the LEP students in the occupational programs. The inability to reallocate funds within his total VEA special needs budget was most frustrating for this respondent. Similar comments were made as well by vocational administrators in the other California sites.

8. Advocates for Services to LEP Populations Generally Faulted the Public Schools But Praised the Community Colleges.

Most representatives in community-based organizations funded to provide services to LEP populations claimed that the majority of their clients were inadequately prepared for occupational training because of deficiencies both in language and in basic skills. As a result, a major proportion of their efforts was devoted to ESL and basic skills instructions as a preliminary to job training, usually provided through another CETA funded program. Although these efforts represented a duplication of service, respondents felt they were needed since, in their view, the public schools were not preparing the LEP students adequately.

With regard to the community colleges, respondents generally acknowledged that administrators were sincere in their attempts to meet the language needs of LEP students. They noted, however that their efforts were similarly constrained due to the severe deficiencies exhibited by LEP students enrolling in the community colleges as a result of "open admission" policies. Nevertheless, it should be noted that few of the CBO representatives participated actively in the planning of LEP programs at the colleges or shared information or resources with vocational administrators. In fact, more often than not, respondents were not aware of the VEA legislation concerning vocational services to LEP populations.

CHAPTER SEVEN
WOMEN

A. LOCAL EDUCATION POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR FEMALE STUDENTS.

1. The Policy of Local Education Agencies Was That of "Equal Educational Opportunity."

Local school administrators stated that the policy of their respective school boards was one of "equal educational opportunity"; therefore, any student could participate in any program or course of instruction, provided that he or she met the requirements for entry, where applicable. In addition, most LEAs had conducted, as required, Title IX Sex Equity reviews. Unfortunately, the primary focus was on the equity issues concerning athletic programs and, secondary, on the review of guidance materials and procedures used to counsel students. Increasing the representation of female students in traditionally male oriented programs did not seem to be a major concern, although in some cases, the reviews had led to considerable modifications in the guidance and career awareness materials made available to students.

At the same time, however, local school administrators stated that priority was being given currently to the "academically" disadvantaged, since local school boards and the public expected the schools to meet the goal of developing students who were literate and capable of handling basic skills competencies. Thus, to the extent that female students manifested some problems with academic performance, they would receive "special" attention. Otherwise, no special attention was focused by policymakers on this issue.

2. Despite the Attention to Female Students in the VEA Admendments, No Policies Existed Concerning Female Participation in Vocational Education Programs, Especially Those Which Were Nontraditional.

In discussions with vocational educators, respondents were aware of the VEA provisions concerning the role of the State Sex Equity Coordinator, who could be a resource to school systems to attend to issues concerning the participation of female students in vocational education programs and courses. However, vocational educators were of two minds regarding this provision. One was that female students as a subgroup had never been denied entry to courses. The other was that most female students had "traditional" values, and would continue to participate in those vocational education programs that were female-dominated; therefore, no pressure should be placed on them to do otherwise. Any special efforts would be resisted by students, parents and the community.

In general, most vocational educators felt that they were living up to the "equal educational opportunity" intent of the VEA amendments, but that federal legislation seldom took into account local values and culture regarding male/female roles. Thus, the policy of most was to permit participation in programs when the student desired to do so, but not to outreach students to encourage increased participation.

3. Community Colleges Had an Explicit Policy of Non-Discrimination According to Sex.

Community college administrators stated that they were concerned about the opportunity for female students to participate in all aspects of their programs. At the same time, they were quick to point out that the adult female student population was mixed and had differing needs; the response on the part of the institutions had been to attempt to provide varied programs for these students. That is, in order to meet the "equal educational opportunity" policy of the college, attention was given to the diversity of the student body, and provisions were made for programming accordingly.

As an example, some administrators stated that their programs for female students tended to be varied and complex. Incoming female students, recently graduated from local high schools had needs that differed from those of older women who wished to return to the world of work, or who wanted to extend or complete their education. Additionally, women in the labor force who needed to upgrade their skills for purposes of occupational mobility needed different types of programs. The college, therefore, was attempting to address these various needs and, where possible, was using state and federal funds to provide special services.

4. Though the Policy of CETA Was "Equal Employment Opportunity," Women Were Often Not Equally Represented in the Varieties of Training Programs.

Interviews with respondents who operated CETA programs and who were advocates in their respective communities for women had differing interpretations of CETA policies regarding the participation of women. Program administrators at the prime sponsor level indicated that staffs took special care to insure that CETA policies with regard to equal employment opportunity were applied to all subcontractors. They also indicated that careful scrutiny was given to programs regarding participation rates of various subsets of the eligible populations. Advocates for women and some subcontractors who provided occupational training to women only presented a different picture. In many sites, especially in larger metropolitan areas, they indicated that either there was limited attention to the needs of female CETA clients or that the participation rates for female CETA clients was not consistent with their participation rates in the labor force.

A case in point was that of San Antonio, Texas. The Mexican American Legal Defense Fund and the National Organization of Women sued the Alamo County CETA program on the basis that Hispanic females, who constituted 22 percent of the labor force, represented only 4 percent of CETA Clients. Hence, they argued that Hispanic females were being discriminated against in terms of "equal employment opportunity" under CETA. The Alamo County CETA consented to the decree and agreed to revamp its policies in order to insure that the participation rates of Hispanic females increased and were commensurate to their participation rate in the labor force.

In other metropolitan areas, advocates stated that although female participation was commensurate to their labor force participation rates, most women were participating in traditional programs. Therefore, they argued, this process would guarantee "unequal" employment opportunity since female-dominated employment generally paid less than male-dominated. They felt that CETA should give more attention to the kinds of training programs available to low-income women.

B. DEFINITION, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. At the Local Education Level, No Special Procedures were Identified Regarding Definition of Female Students.

None of the LEAs visited had developed or instituted special procedures to identify or encourage potential female or male candidates from participation in nontraditional programs. On the other hand, none of the LEAs prevented interested students from participating in any program solely on the basis of sex. Thus, in all cases, the identification and participation of males and females in nontraditional vocational programs were left up to the initiative and interests of each student.

2. Despite State and Federal Guidelines Regarding Sex Stereotyping, School Personnel Were Reluctant to Implement These Guidelines.

Almost all local school administrators and all vocational education personnel interviewed were knowledgeable about state and federal guidelines regarding sex stereotyping. However, many were hesitant in implementing these guidelines. The reasons given were two. First, the federal and state guidelines failed to take into account local values and culture. Second, "open admissions" had always been the prevailing policy but few female students had availed themselves of the opportunity. Moreover, guidelines placed too much emphasis on statistics and numbers. Thus, for example, to be in compliance, the Director of Vocational Education in Oakland, California, had to show that in each traditionally male oriented program at least 20 percent of the students were females. The reverse was also the requirement for males in traditional female programs. Yet, as put by this respondent, "the guidelines are inflexible, how can I force students to enroll in these programs if they are unwilling to do so?"

School administrators felt that they were in a "no-win" position regarding state and federal guidelines. On the one hand, should they vigorously pursue their implementation, they would have to deal with hostile community forces, many of whom felt that the schools were already too involved in "liberal" causes potentially destructive to family and community life. On the other hand, if they failed to implement the guidelines, they ran the risk of losing state and federal funds which were desperately needed for the support of school programs.

3. Identification and Placement Policies at the Community Colleges Varied According to Student Needs.

At the community colleges, identification and placement of students varied according to their needs. For identification purposes, community colleges had established procedures for tracking and recording the number of female students who were in "nontraditional" programs; this was the case for male students, as well. Many, in order to increase the participation of both male and female students in nontraditional programs, were offering counseling sessions, usually as a part of freshman orientation or as a part of career orientation programs at the college to introduce students to the variety of options available in occupation/vocational areas. Additionally, Sex Equity Coordinators at the college worked with classroom instructors and departmental chairs to insure that guidelines regarding sex stereotyping were available, understood and applied in counseling female and male students.

Many of the community colleges operated Women's Centers. In general, the role of these programs was to provide psychological and career counseling to female students who desired them. Identification and placement, therefore, were voluntary. Often, as a part of these centers, there were special programs for older women who were returning to education prior to reentry or entry into the labor force. For these women, there were usually special procedures regarding eligibility. The reentry programs, often called "displaced homemaker" programs, required that the eligible clients meet criteria of age, income status, marital status, numbers of dependents, and former education or employment status. The criteria differed from program to program, but almost all had the same dimensions; that is, the female participant, had to be an older woman, usually over thirty, of low-income status without a spouse and also the sole economic provider for the household. Though these programs did not discriminate according to sex, in most cases, 95 percent or more of the participants were female.

4. CETA Programs Required Female Participants to Meet Their Guidelines.

Female participants in CETA programs had to meet the CETA eligible guidelines of low-income, unemployment or underemployment, and/or disabling condition. However, researchers found that many programs targeted to female clients had unique sets of problems regarding the identification and placement of their clients. In interviews with program staffs who provided training and employment services to females who were Hispanic or White ethnic, respondents pointed to difficulties in identifying these clients; hence, their participation rates in CETA programs were often very low. For example, one staff person, herself Hispanic, stated that Hispanic cultures tended to insulate and isolate the women from the larger culture. Thus, when there was a need for a social service such as CETA, the women were often ignorant of the services available. Because these women tended to have friends who were in the same conditon, and who had access to the same, often limited sources of information, it became difficult to disseminate information to them. The burden on the program, therefore, she explained, was to undertake outreach activities so that information could reach the potentially eligible clients, and then, to attempt to establish a trust relationship so that the client would be willing to seek services from the center.

Program staff in a large metropolitan area which targeted employment training services to White ethnic women indicated that they, too, had unique problems related to the identification of the potentially eligible client. Because of the sense of family pride, often, females were hesitant to seek external assistance. Many, as one staff person stated, "would prefer to stay poor than accept help, which is seen always as 'welfare.'" Thus, according to staff, the problem for the female who needed help, especially in the absence of a spouse, was to overcome negative perceptions regarding the service and the role the service might have in helping the client to maintain her "pride."

Given these types of problems, program staff who worked with low income minority and White-ethnic female populations felt that CETA policies often were not attendant to these unique needs, and the problems inherent in addressing them. They pointed to the need for more time to outreach the population and the need for more career and psychological counseling for these populations. The failure to attend to these issues well, many argued, resulted in disproportionate number of female clients participating in traditionally female dominated skill and occupational training programs.

C. PLANNING FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. Planning for the Participation of Female Students in Vocational Education Programs Was, in Most Cases, the Responsibility of Central Office Administration.

At almost all sites visited by researchers, typically, one person at central administrative headquarters was designated with the responsibility for oversight of planning activities related to sex equity. Most often titled the "Sex Equity Coordinator," the job description was consistent with responsibilities identified in VEA legislative guidelines. However, rarely was this individual a person with a background in vocational education. Most often, the person was a counselor or had been an academic teacher. Moreover, the person often performed more than one function.

For example, at sites in New York State one coordinator was both the Special Education Coordinator and the Sex Equity Coordinator. Given the local school board's concern with the implementation of P.L. 94-142 guidelines, most of her time was spent in insuring that the procedures attendant to that piece of legislation were followed. Another coordinator was both the Bilingual Education Coordinator and the Sex Equity Coordinator. In this site much attention was given by the local school board to "equal educational opportunity" for the increasing Hispanic population. Therefore, she had little time to devote to the sex equity issues beyond distribution of materials to program coordinators and school administrators. This same tended to be true in other urban areas and, especially so, for smaller urban and rural sites, where as standard procedure, staff tended to function in several roles.

2. Vocational Educators Had Limited Involvement in Program Planning for the Participation of Female Students.

With the exception of the participation of female students in regular vocational education programs, vocational educators were seldom involved in the planning activities related to female students. Where female students participated in vocational education programs, placement was generally in traditionally female-dominated areas. This was the case in most sites, though there were often some female students in nontraditional programs. For example, vocational educators or staff in schools that researchers visited generally pointed to one or a few female students in classes such as Auto Mechanics or Welding. However, they were usually quick to establish that all classes were open to all students who were qualified, irrespective of sex. Thus, although some female students participated in nontraditional programs, as a rule, there were no policies or planning activities related to counseling programs for encouraging female students and for attempting to systematically increase their participation in nontraditional programs over time.

There was evidence, however, of disproportionate enrollment of female students in some "nontraditional" programs. This was particularly the case in school districts in the Southwest. In one large urban LEA, female participation in Auto Mechanics classes had been running at one-third of the class for more than four years. Respondents, however, could not attribute this pattern of participation to any set of conditions. While satisfied with the results, it did not appear that the district or the vocational program had made any special counseling or outreach efforts to encourage female student participation.

At another site, in a rural school district, the local school superintendent indicated that female participation in all vocational education programs, other than Home Economics, had always been high, approximately one-third to one half. Classroom teachers in vocational industrial arts and in vocational agriculture stated that not only was female participation high, but that the females tended to be better students, since they seemed to be more self-directed and more mature than their male counterparts. When researchers asked the instructors to explain the reasons for the high participation rates, each stated that, given the isolation of the area, the female students participated in order to develop those skills necessary for survival as a homemaker. They stated further that most of the female students married their "high school sweetheart" after graduation and often remained in the area. Inasmuch as the economic bases for the area were ranching, agriculture and oil/gas drilling, the male spouse generally worked far away from the home. and the woman had to be self-reliant. Few of the female students go on to postsecondary education, and the few who did, rarely majored in "nontraditional" vocational education programs.

At this same site male participation in Home-Economics had also increased substantially. The Home Economics instructors suggested that since many of the male students attended college after graduation, they were concerned as well about their ability to be self-reliant. It seemed that over the past four years, the numbers of male students enrolled in courses in Homemaking had increased dramatically, from one to two per year to over eight per year for the current school year.

3. Female Participation on Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education Was Negligible.

Researchers were able to identify female participants on local advisory councils in less than half of the cases. Interviews were held with female council members at two different sites. In both cases. each respondent indicated frustration and dissatisfaction with the councils and the general lack of attention and concern about the needs of female students.

One of the respondents, a member on the local advisory council stated that the council operated as an "old boy network." As the only female representative on the council, she had offered many suggestions and recommendations to the membership about the need for more female student participation in "nontraditional" vocational education programs. Yet, the council paid little attention to these concerns. The second respondent, a member on a state advisory council, confirmed the same set of attitudes and behaviors. She stated that, though frustrated, she was determined to have the council do something and was prepared to "wait it out." She felt, however, that as female membership on councils increased, the opportunity to effect changes would be greater.

4. Planning for Female Students at the Community Colleges Was Undertaken by a Variety of Program Staff.

Consistent with the policy of providing programs addressing the different needs of subsets of students, planning activities at the community colleges tended to be undertaken by a variety of individuals each of whom was responsible for different types of programs. Directions came from the central administation, but planning had to be consistent with the guidelines for funding. This often resulted in a complex mix of planning activities.

The guiding principle was "equal educational opportunity," but given the different program eligibility requirements, program staffs had to be sensitive to these particularities. For example, often the "Displaced Homemaker" programs for older women and men were funded jointly by VEA funds and CETA funds. The Women's Center might include the Displaced Homemaker Programs as sub-projects, but might receive funding primarily from the state and local governments. If the centers provided career counseling and some programs in basic skills training, they might receive funds under the higher education compensatory education legislations of the state and federal governments. Additionally, all or some of the projects, should they accommodate CETA clients, might receive a portion of their funding from CETA.

Given the complexity of the funding patterns for these programs, it was difficult to identify any one person who had major responsibility for program planning at the community colleges. The comptroller or chief financial officer of the college usually was aware of the varieties of funds available and had the responsibility for insuring that the funds were used in the manner intended by the respective legislations.

5. Community-Based Groups Serving Training and Employment Needs of Females Planned Their Programs Independently; No Pattern Was Evident.

Researchers were able to identify a variety of community-based and advocacy groups for women in most communities, especially in urban areas. However, they were varied in scope and in interests. The range was from the more prominent Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), to self-help and consciousness-raising groups. Most provided some form of psychological and career counseling. Some provided skill and occupational training courses to varying degrees. Some had stable funding bases, some did not. Planning activities, therefore, varied. What researchers were able to identify was the existence of a network among these community-based groups. However, researchers were unable to identify or capture patterns by which planning was undertaken jointly among or across the various groups in order to provide comprehensive service.

6. Planning by CETA Sponsored Programs Was Done at Two Levels: Prime Sponsor and Individual Subcontractor.

Planning activities for CETA organizations occurred at two levels: the prime sponsor and the individual subcontractor levels. The degree to which these levels of planning overlapped and were congruent varied from site to site. In general, at the prime sponsor level, program staff indicated that, given the size of the populations served and the number of subcontractors involved, staff could do little more than monitor program operations according to the legislative guidelies. That monitoring function was usually reduced to the review of reports filed by the respective subcontractors on an annual or semiannual basis. In some instances, the monitoring function incorporated the criteria estabished by the Employment Development and Training Council. This was the case in the City of Chicago, where the Council established program priorities according to its review of various demographic and other data. Since, in this instance, the major function of the prime sponsor was that of accountability, staff had more time to devote to reviews of the performance of individual subcontractors. This case was unusual rather than the norm.

At the subcontractor level, planning activities varied according to the nature of the clients serviced and the local guidelines. Programs which had women as the primary clients voiced many concerns about their ability to provide adequate service. For example, most stated that CETA seldom saw women as a focal population for service. This was the case in Chicago, where staff at CETA-sponsored programs stated that though the accountability procedures were good, they felt that more attention should be given to the needs of women by the Employment/Training Advisory Council which established the program priorities, and determined where and how CETA funds should be applied across programs.

In San Antonio, Texas, program staff at three of the subcontractors, whose target population was primarily women, stated that the administrative procedures inhibited the ability of the subcontractors to plan effectively. Most felt that the paperwork required by the prime sponsor was too heavy and tended to overload administrative staffs, diminishing the time they had to plan for program implementation. Additionally, they complained that the time allowed for follow-up of client's progress subsequent to training was insufficient. It should be added, that most CETA subcontractors felt that the 90-day follow-up was insufficient.

Staff at women's programs also indicated that they had unique problems that required more planning time. For example, they stated that considerable time had to be spent in sensitizing employers to the needs of female employees, especially those who were heads of households. Thus, staff persons often found that they had to walk a "tightrope" between educating the employer or personnel at the employment site and, at the same time, maintaining good relationships in order to guarantee future employment for clients at that site. This issue was seen as frustrating and time consuming, and was given little consideration by prime-sponsor staff in its planning and operating activities.

D. STRATEGIES FOR PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

1. No Strategy Could be Identified Regarding the Participation of Female Students in Vocational Education Programs.

Researchers identified strategies regarding the participation of students in programs for "regular," "special," or "separate" vocational education programs, depending on some form of academic disadvantagement. However, no strategy related to sex could be identified. Patterns of participation for regular vocational education programs were consistent across programs in all sites. If a student elected to participate in a vocational education program, and, assuming no major academic deficiencies and no objection by the respective classroom teacher, the student was permitted to participate. Female students, when they elected to participate in vocational education, most often, enrolled in traditional female- dominated programs. As mentioned above, all sites had personnel functioning in the role of Sex Equity Coordinator. In general, these individuals were functioning in several roles, and had little time to devote attention to female participation in vocational education programs, in general, and "nontraditional" vocational education programs, in particular. Hence, little attention was given to patterns of participation in vocational education programs, nor were strategies developed to attempt to alter these patterns.

In short, a type of "benign neglect" appeared to be the typical approach regarding female participation in "nontraditional" vocational education programs. Vocational educators were happy to point out the exceptions with regard to female participation in nontraditional offerings; but, appeared not to be concerned or involved in any activities that might increase such participation. School guidance counselors and school administrators followed a rule of "leave well enough alone," since they were concerned about probable negative consequences from the community, should school staff be seen as actively encouraging females to participate in classes where the majority of the students were males.

Some women's advocates argued that the strategy in vocational education programs was to discourage females from participating in vocational education programs. For example, in New York City, a women's group conducting a survey of the enrollment of female students in New York City's vocational high schools found the enrollment 25 to 30 percent less than that reported by the board. They presented researchers with two sets of figures: one reported by the New York City Board of Education, the other based on their own survey. In each instance, the data from their survey revealed female enrollments to be substantially less than those of the Board of Education. When respondents at the Board were questioned as to the discrepancy, staff personnel stated that the high schools, especially the principals were reluctant to "rock the boat." One staff person indicated that the principals in the New York City Vocational High Schools had considerable power and had established strong relationships with employers in the trades, leading to good job opportunities for the graduates. In general, since many of the high schools have been and still were male dominated, they did not wish to have the operations and procedures changed by any influx of female students. Hence, most principals had resisted and discouraged female students from attending these schools. This same staff person indicated that minority female students "get the worst end of the deal because often they do not get any counseling in their junior high schools and, when they apply for employment, even in female dominated areas, they get the lower paying jobs." Hence, she argued, in a city where over 70 percent of the students were Black and Hispanic, there was a real need for females, especially minority females to get the skills training that would lead to better paying jobs, and the vocational high schools could serve as the mechanism to achieve that goal.

2. At the Community College Level, the Strategy Was to Provide Programs Responsive to the Needs of the Various SubSets of Female Students.

Researchers were able to identify a variety of strategies for addressing the needs of the various subgroups of female students enrolled in community college programs. These strategies ranged from psychological support and counseling to instruction in nontraditional vocational and career areas. Essentially, the types of programs identified were as follows:

a. Counseling and Guidance.

Whether a part of the orientation program to the college or as a part of a special project, all programs and projects had a counseling and guidance component related to the goals and objectives of the program. For entering students, the Office of Counseling and Guidance of the college usually had the responsibility for providing information about the college, its programs, their eligibility requirements and the options available to all students. This was generally done in small groups, though individual counseling sessions occurred upon request.

Many of the college counseling offices ran special counseling workshops for female students related to vocational, job and work skills development problems related specifically to female students (e.g., assertiveness training, development of a network for support, child care, time management, etc.). These workshops were often available to all female students or were provided in conjunction with special projects for subsets of female students, such as older women who wished to enter/reenter the labor market.

b. Vocational Skill Development/New Careers.

Other programs and projects focused on providing information and instruction to female students who were interested in "nontraditional" vocational or career programs. For example, at Dutchess County Community College in Dutchess County New York (Poughkeepsie), VEA funds were used to outreach and provide counseling support to female students who were interested in or might be interested in "nontraditional" vocational programs. Though a pilot project, the counseling elements of the program had been retained and made part of the activities provided by the college's Office of Counseling and Guidance.

The project, developed by college administrators and departmental personnel in Electrical Technology, was designed to prepare female students in careers in Electrical Technology. Prior to the inception of the project, no females had been enrolled in the Department. During the project, five female students enrolled. The average of five female students enrolled in the program had remained stable since the termination of the pilot effort.

Conversely, it should be noted that Dutchess County Community College also used VEA funds to pilot a similar effort to outreach and prepare male students for "nontraditional" vocations. In Dutchess County, there were severe shortages of health service personnel. The need was particularly acute for nursing staff. The college used VEA funds to outreach and train male students for nursing careers. Prior to the pilot effort, one to two males had been enrolled; during the project, twenty-two male students enrolled and completed the program in Nursing. Since the termination of the project, male participation in the program had remained at substantially the same level.

c. Displaced Homemaker Programs.

Researchers were able to identify special programs for older women who were heads of households and needed to return to the labor force. These programs, usually supported by CETA funds, though not limited to females, usually had high female participation (over 90 percent). Criteria for participation were related to CETA income eligibility. Participants were provided with individualized career counseling and psychological support, since many had been away from the labor force for many years. Many of these programs also had a job development component, in which program staff attempted to develop job opportunities and place participants in jobs at entry-level. Though not always successful, the programs attempted to prepare the participants for employment in nontraditional areas. However, given the limited skills of many of the participants, as well as the CETA limitation concerning eligibility for subsidy while enrolled in the program, many participants were trained for employment in traditionally female dominated employment such as office work, child care, health care, etc.

3. CETA Sponsored Programs Had a Variety of Strategies; but Only a Few Were Specific to Women.

While CETA sponsored programs addressed the need for equal employment opportunity for the economically disadvantaged, strategies specific to enhancing the economic skills and opportunities for women participants were limited. At the prime sponsor level, where policy was formulated, women were usually not considered a focal population for special attention. Rather, guidelines were developed to insure that there was equitable representation of women across the programs contracted to various organizations. Thus, at this level, the concern was for equity in terms of enrollment of women in programs relative to their participation in the labor force and their numbers in the community.

Displaced Homemaker Program, a federal labor department effort, was usually funded at a minimal level. For example, in the City of Chicago, $150,000 was allocated for the Displaced Homemaker Program that had been awarded to the City-Wide Colleges of Chicago, the community college of the city. Respondents who worked with the program and with other programs that provided education and employment services for women pointed to the low dollar figure as an indication that CETA did not consider programs for women to be important. They also pointed out that the displaced homemaker population in the city was sizable, and that the allocation was not commensurate to need. The strategy was developed, however, to make maximum use of the limited funding by outstationing a counselor in two other programs to provide guidance to low-income, minority and Hispanic women, many of whom were displaced homemakers.

As mentioned above, in San Antonio, Texas, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund and the National Organization of Women jointly sued the Alamo County CETA because of the disproportionately low participation of Mexican American women in the CETA programs. Respondents who represented a diversity of women's programs in San Antonio, many of whom received CETA funding, pointed to the consent decree as evidence of the low priority given to women and their employment needs on the part of local CETA programs.

Researchers, however, identified a variety of programs at all sites funded by CETA that did address the employment and education needs of women. For example, at several sites, CETA contracted with the local community colleges to provide special programs or pilot projects for women who were low-income. In fact, the relationship between CETA and the community colleges appeared to be a very close one. Problems attendant to the relationship, however, were of several types: organizational, it was often unclear with whom the college was to work and get information; instructional, often CETA wanted the college to provide separate instruction for CETA clients, rather than permit CETA clients to participate in existing classes of the same kind; and, financial, the colleges often felt that CETA should either allow more time for clients to complete instruction, or that the CETA contribution to cover "indirect costs" attached to the provision of instruction was insufficient. Despite these problems, CETA funding of programs for women could generally be found at the local community colleges, among the programs funded.

At the contractor level, researchers were able to identify a discrepancy between the intended outcome of the program and the instruction offered. This was not by design, but a result of the nature of the problems which many of the clients brought to the programs. Many of the CETA-sponsored programs desired to train women for "nontraditional" employment. However, the complexity of the disadvantagements often negated the possibility of achieving this goal. For example, at one program in San Antonio, the staff discovered that many of the Hispanic women who came to them insisted that they be trained in "traditional" areas, because of the image of the job and the need to secure full-time employment as quickly as possible. Hence, the program did not achieve the desired outcome regarding participation rates of women in "nontraditional" employment. At the same time, however, for those women who were interested in "nontraditional" employment, and/or who planned to continue their education and training after CETA support had terminated, the program had developed an alumni association that raised funds to support the educational and employment aspirations of former CETA female clients.

It seems a fair assessment of CETA that there were provisions that addressed the employment needs of women. However, given the extensive needs of female clients, funding for "separate" programs was limited. To the extent that the prime sponsor monitored all contractors to insure that women were represented on an equitable basis in these programs, the employment needs of women were considered.

4. Community-Based Organizations Provided a Variety of Training and Employment Services for Women, in Most Cases these Services were Limited.

Researchers were able to identify a variety of community-based organizations in major urban centers which provided a variety of education and employment services to women. In rural and small cities however, such services were limited or nonexistent. The absence or limitation of such services to women in rural areas and small towns could not be attributed to any general set of rules or conditions. For example, in rural areas and small towns in the Northeastern section of the country, women seemed to be aware of many developments in the larger women's movement, though no services, or limited services, were available. In the South and Southeast, the attitudes of women varied. Some felt that there was a need for services; others felt that there was not.

In the large metropolitan areas, researchers identifed a variety of community-based services, from the local YWCA to a variety of self-help women's organizations. In general, the community-based groups seemed to have a network and many were aware of each other's operations. In some sites, however, there were instances of competition between organizations that provided training and employment services to women. For example, in areas where both the Black and Hispanic populations were sizable, women's groups tended to service either, but rarely both. In most instances, except for the YWCA, the financial base of the organizations was uncertain and staff spent considerable time identifying sources of support. There also appeared to be limited attention to the use of political tools for helping to achieve their goals of equality. Program staffs often talked about what "they" (local politicians) did or did not do regarding addressing the needs of women, but rarely did they formulate a political strategy to force local politicians to address the needs of their clients.

In terms of services provisions, however, most felt that they were providing a much needed service to their respective clients. Specifically, they felt that they were more sensitive to the needs of their clients than the staff of traditional employment programs and, moreover, that they had better skills to outreach the potential population that could benefit from their service. Most importantly, they felt that they provided psychological support to their clients, a service that often was absent in the home-life or larger environment of the female client.

E. RESOURCES UTILIZED TO PROVIDE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR FEMALE STUDENTS.

1. At the Local Educational Level, No Resources for Providing Services for Female Students Were Identified.

Female students were participants in a variety of vocational education programs at all sites. Most were enrolled in those programs which prepared students for traditionally female-dominated programs such as Business and Nursing. Female students also participated in "special" or "separate" programs for academically disadvantaged and handicapped students. However, researchers were unable to identify district-wide programs or special guidance and conseling services targeted to female students solely for the purpose of encouraging increased participation in nontraditional vocational education programs.

Sex Equity Coordinators were present and functioning at all sites, though, as mentioned above, most had other roles that interfered with the effort they could devote to the sex equity function. Classroom teachers in vocational education and in academic subjects were aware of the variety of materials available regarding strategies for the reduction of sex stereotyping in their classrooms. Most systems also had established sex equity committees for the purpose of reviewing materials and for eliminating those that were found inappropriate. These efforts seemed to be the extent of activities available regarding services to female students. Clearly, the approach was passive: LEAs did whatever was necessary to comply with federal and state guidelines and civil rights laws but stopped short of activities that might alienate parent and other community residents.

It should be mentioned that school personnel appeared to be uneasy about their roles as related to equity for female students. Many felt that any action on their part would lead to some form of controversy. For example, school personnel in "conservative" communities were quick to point out that they were concerned about the conflict between any supposed "aggressive" behavior on behalf of female students, and the anticipated hostility from the community might result from such actions. On the other hand, many school administrators felt that the system did not discriminate and that equality of educational opportunity had always existed. The presence or absence of substantial numbers of female students in "nontraditional" vocational education programs was viewed as no cause for alarm, since it represented individual desires. Thus, the absence of female students in these courses or programs was attributable to choice and not to barriers or policies followed by the school system.

2. Community Colleges Made Extensive Uses of VEA Funds, as well as Others Sources of Funds to Develop and Implement Programs for the Variety of Female Students Enrolled.

Community colleges appeared to make extensive use of the variety of funding sources available so as to develop and implement a variety of programs for the differing subsets of female students enrolled. College administrators were quick to point out that they took their policy of "equal educational opportunity" very seriously, and that they had to demonstrate their credibility to the local communities through their responsiveness to community needs. Hence, many of the colleges had intimate involvement with a variety of federal, state, and local programs that addressed the needs of disadvantaged populations, including women.

Many of the community colleges utilized VEA funds to pilot test programs to outreach and counsel both men and women students about options regarding "nontraditional" programs. Where successful, these programs were then adopted and incorporated into the regular college programs. Usually, the counseling function became a part of the Office of Counseling and Guidance, and materials and other strategies were incorporated by the respective departments in their instructional practices.

It was not unusual to find close interaction between the community colleges and CETA programs. In some instances, as in the case of Indian River Community College in Fort Pierce, Florida, the community college was awarded the contract by the Balance of State prime sponsor to operate the entire CETA program and efforts were made to train and place women in non-traditional occupations. However, for most community colleges, the mode was for the college to be contracted as the agency administering the Displaced Homemaker Program providing a variety of services needed by this population.

Many colleges also operated Continuing Education Centers for Women. Although some services were consistent across programs, many differed since the activities were designed to be responsive to the needs of the women in the respective community. When the local community was middle class in orientation, the Center's services tended to focus on self-development activities. On the other hand, when the college was located in an urban area and attracted substantial numbers of low-income women, then services varied from the development of basic survival skills such as time management, day care, legal services, etc., to remedial academic skills development as prerequisites for entry into CETA skill-training programs or regular college curricula.

In general, therefore, community colleges generally undertook needs assessments to determine which subgroups required services and were not receiving those services. On the basis of these data, administrators attempted to locate the resources and array the various funding sources around the needs of the intended target population. Thus, Continuing Education Centers for Women might receive CETA funds, VEA funds for a pilot effort, local funds, and funds from other human resource agencies at the state or federal levels.

3. The Resources Utilized by Community-Based Groups Were Mixed.

In large urban areas especially, researchers were able to identify a variety of community-based employment and training organizations that provided services to women. The financial resources for these groups were mixed although usually limited. Groups such as the YWCA tended to have firm financial support coming from a variety of sources: the United Way, private philanthropies, grants from state, local and federal agencies, and member subscriptions. Other groups, especially those which were self-help, were experiencing financial difficulties. Member subscription fees were low and in general, the funds available were insufficient to cover all operating costs. Staff in these programs, therefore, made considerable efforts to identify potential funding sources from the array of philanthropies, local, state, and federal agencies.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS/SERVICES ON WOMEN

1. Special Policy Regarding the Servicing of Female Students in Vocational Education Programs Could Not Be Identified at the LEA Level.

The broad educational policy of most local education agencies was that of "equal educational opportunity." Most school personnel felt that female students had the opportunity to participate in any program they desired as long as they could meet the academic entrance requirements. The presence or absence of female students in "nontraditional" or traditional vocational education programs was viewed by school personnel as the outcome of each student's personal choice and, therefore, services and programs beyond those that already existed were not thought to be needed.

2. No Special Procedures Regarding the Identification or Placement of Female Students Could Be Identified at the Local Education Agency Level.

Researchers could not identify any special procedures related to the identification and placement of female students in vocational education programs. Identification and placement in programs appeared to operate on a voluntary basis. Those female students who wished to participate in vocational education classes indicated so and were placed, provided that all other requirements could be met.

Women's advocates, however, indicated that the voluntary system did not work. They stated that female students were discouraged from entry into "nontraditional" vocational education programs by school guidance counselors or by school administrators. Additionally, they argued that minority female students suffered disproportionately more than their White counterparts because they seldom received counseling and guidance services in their home, schools, and therefore had no knowledge of the options available to them.

3. No Special Planning Activites Related to the Placement of Female Students in Vocational Education Programs Were Identified.

Though researchers were able to identify the Sex Equity Coordinator at all sites, the individual did not participate in planning activites related to the placement of female students in vocational programs. If a female student wished to participate in regular vocational programs, she applied and was accepted or rejected. Most, however, applied for admission to traditionally female-dominated programs. Typically, female students received little or no counseling regarding other program options, and therefore, were not likely to apply for admission to nontraditional programs. Should a female student have applied, however, most likely she would have had to secure the approval of the receiving vocational education instructor, and depending on the personal attitudes of the instructor, she might or might not be accepted in the class.

If she was "academically" disadvantaged and special programs in vocational education were operating in the school system, she had an equal chance of being placed in one of those programs. If she was "economically disadvantaged," and applied to participate in any of the work study programs, she would probably be accepted, if a sufficient number of slots existed. If she was handicapped and there were special programs for handicapped students in vocational education, she most likely would be placed in those programs. However, researchers could identify no programs operating solely for female students at the local education level in terms of career/vocational awareness, career/vocational guidance, and outreach for placement in "nontraditional" vocational education programs.

Researchers did identify sites where significant numbers of female students were enrolled in "nontraditional" vocational education programs. Ironically, these sites were either in rural or small cities, where female students were enrolled because they saw the acquistion of such skills as necessary for survival as homemakers in isolated areas.

4. No Special Strategies for Servicing Female Students Could be Identified at the Local Education Level.

Given the absence of special attention to female students at the policy and planning levels, it was not surprising to find that no special strategies existed for encouraging female student participation in "nontraditional" programs. Female students were participating in vocational education programs to the degree that they manifested membership in other categories of students, e.g., disadvantaged, handicapped, and could meet the requirements for entrance in the regular or separate programs.

In short, if a female student wished to participate in a vocational education program, she would rarely be given counseling regarding the options available. In the absence of such information, the likelihood was that she would opt for participation in a female-dominated program.

5. **No Utilization of VEA Funds for Support of Services for Female Students Were Identified.**

In a few cases, it appeared that VEA funds were used to support the purchase of guidance materials through the Sex Equity Coordinator. In no case, however, did researchers identify the use of VEA funds for direct services to female students either before or after placement in vocational education classes.

6. **In Most Cases, When Female Students Participated in Vocational Programs, They Were Enrolled in Female-Dominated Programs.**

At the local education level, when most females participated in vocational education programs, they tended to participate in those which would prepare them for employment in traditionally female-dominated programs, e.g., Business, Nursing and Health Services, and Child Care. Occasionally, a female student would opt for participation in a nontraditional vocational education program such as Auto Repair, Small Machine Repair, Carpentry, etc.; however, her participation would be dependent on the willingness of the instructor to allow her to enter the class. The attitudes of vocational education instructors regarding female participation in male-dominated programs were mixed; hence, her admission was uncertain. While counseling programs existed and were said to contain guidelines and strategies for reducing sex-role stereotyping, and while materials for instruction addressing this issue also existed, rarely could researchers identify counseling programs geared to inform female or male students of potential options in "nontraditional" courses or programs.

7. **At the Community College Level, the Goal was "Equal Education Opportunity" as Related to the Subsets of Female Students Who Were Enrolled.**

Community college personnel were concerned about the colleges' responsiveness to the subsets of female enrollees. To that end, attention focused on the identification and needs of the various subgroups: younger, entering students, older, reentering students who desired to upgrade their skills and gain credentials; and, older, first-entering female students, usually low-income and head of household. Having identified the various sets of students, planning activities centered on the design of programs specific to the needs of the female students and on the identification of potential resources to implement those programs. Usual resources employed to support these varied programs were CETA, local district funds, state and federal human resources programs, and philanthropies. Programs usually tapped a variety of resources so as to provide the comprehensive mix of services needed by the female students.

8. CETA-Sponsored Program Had Mixed Responses to the Needs of Female Clients.

CETA programs responded to the needs of female clients in differing ways and varied according to levels of policy and planning. In general, at the prime-sponsor level, the concern was that female clients be represented across programs according to federal and state guidelines established by the legislation, and by the Employment Development and Training Councils. Prime-sponsor staffs, therefore, monitored programs to insure that these guidelines were met. In some cases, these guidelines were not monitored carefully and female representation among the client populations appeared to be inequitable relative to representation of females in the labor force in the community. Where these cases existed, community-based advocates for women argued that this was clear evidence that CETA programs were not sensitive to the needs of women. Additionally, the low funding level for Displaced Homemaker Programs, whose clients were mostly females, was also cited by women's advocates as further proof of CETA insensitivity to women and women's status as a low-priority population.

On the other hand, some CETA programs that contracted to organizations that targeted training and employment services to female populations seemed to be successful. Staff expressed satisfaction with their ability to provide the needed training and counseling to the clients despite problems of prime sponsor "insensitivity" and "burdensome administrative requirements." In almost all sites, except those in rural areas, researchers could identify organizations contracted by CETA to provide training and employment services to females. Interviews with staffs of these organizations revealed that they were disappointed with CETA, particularly in terms of regulations which they felt were burdensome or inappropriate for their client population. However, these same staffs indicated that they had a high degree of satisfaction with their success in meeting the employment and education needs of their clients, and, feedback from their clients indicated that they, too, were satisfied with the services they had received.

9. Community-Based Women's Groups Addressed a Range of Subgroups of Female Clients.

Rarely did researchers find community-based groups who were advocates for women in rural areas and small towns. At some sites, interest in women's issues seemed high; at others, however, attitudes were negative and there appeared to be no interest among leaders in the community. On the other hand, in larger metropolitan areas, many community-based programs for women were identified, some with no financial support from public agencies. The range of services ran from those at the YWCA to those provided by "store-front" self-help groups. Finanical support for these groups ranged from stable, as in the case of the YWCA that could tap United Way, philanthropies and sizable membership subscriptions, to meager for the self-help groups.

The agencies were often part of an informal network and researchers were referred in many cases to other sister agencies. Most felt that their organizations met the needs of special subgroups of women; such as severely economically disadvantaged, those with a special focus such as The Arts, etc. Most indicated dismay by the lack of sensitivity to and awareness of women's issues and problems exhibited by local politicians. Despite this however, researchers were unable to identify a coalition representing women's interests with the resources needed to bring about changes in the political context in which they operated.

CHAPTER EIGHT
INDIANS

This study of vocational education options and opportunities available in local communities for special needs populations offered no basis for drawing conclusions regarding the present status of vocational education for Indians. Few, if any, Indians were among the populations represented in each of the communities researchers visited. In only one LEA, Oakland, did we find a supervisor, housed in the Bilingual Office, in charge of Indian education programs. None of the community colleges visited provided special services or administered separate programs for Indian populations. Finally, one community-based organization, the Consortium of United Indian Nations, in the Oakland-San Francisco Bay area, could be identified as specifically serving the employment and training needs of adult Indians. Following are some observations on vocational education for Indians based primarily on the Oakland, California, interview data as well on comments made by respondents in other sites.

A. LOCAL POLICY CONCERNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR INDIANS.

Virtually none of the board members or administrative decision-makers interviewed at the public schools or at the community colleges could identify a specific board policy addressing the issue of education in general or vocational education in particular for Indian students. Perhaps the only exception was in Oakland where respondents pointed to the school board's recent approval of a recommendation made by the superindentent that a federally funded position be created for a supervisor of Indian education.

Even in Oakland however, the office was considered a component of the bilingual program and the supervisor was primarily responsible for administrative matters concerning the identification of Indian students in the district and the review of school site plans to verify that each school with ten or more Indian students took appropriate measures to serve their special needs. This supervisor, however, the only Indian administrator in the district, had not been involved in school or district-wide curriculum or instructional decisions affecting the education of Indians.

At the community college district level, all policies and programs were generally guided by the philosophy to serve the educational needs of all students and members for the community. Indeed, this philosophy provided the basis for the establishment of all community college services and programs for special needs students including the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the limited-English proficient and women. Therefore, according to respondents, special services for Indians were not available primarily because the enrollment of such students was very low and the needs were not apparent.

The representatives at the Consortium of United Indian Nations indicated that all policies guiding their programs and services were based on the federal CETA legislation. In response to an RFP, this five-county consortium in the Northern California Bay area had been awarded a grant by the Department of Labor, Washington CETA Office, to serve both the employment and training needs of adult Indians in the community.

B. DEFINITIONS, IDENTIFICATION, AND PLACEMENT OF INDIANS IN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

Except for Oakland, California, none of the LEAs visited had established procedures for identifying or placing Indian students in academic, general or vocational programs. In effect then, if such students were enrolled in the high schools, procedures for placement into existing regular vocational programs would be the same as those applicable to all students. Typically, these procedures included vocational interests and ability to meet the language and academic course requirements. Criteria and procedures for placement into special needs vocational programs have been described in previous Chapters of this report.

Indian students were identfied by the Oakland public schools primarily through self reports. A survey was administered at the time of registration requesting information from all students in the district about language(s) spoken in the home as well as their ethnic origin and heritage. This survey also served to identify potential limited-English proficient students in the schools. According to the supervisor of Indian education, many students were reluctant to identify themselves on the survey forms as Indians and claimed instead other nationalities. As a result, he was forced to institute procedures for making telephone contacts as well as home visits. Although time consuming, he felt that the process was important in order to get an accurate count of the number of Indians in the schools.

Presently, approximately 600 students had been identified, although, according to his estimates twice as many were enrolled in the schools. Of the 600 identified, less than 60 were high school students; 19 were seniors, none currently graduating with a vocational diploma and only one planning to continue in postsecondary education. No data or estimates were available either from the supervisor of Indian education or the director of vocational education regarding the number of Indian students presumably enrolled in vocational programs or the number who had applied but had not been accepted.

At the postsecondary level, none of the community colleges attempted to identify Indian students for special services or programming. Thus, the students in all cases were integrated among the general student populations and, therefore, received no special considerations. Nevertheless, most colleges identified Indian students for administrative purposes such as preparation of aggregate student enrollment data submitted to state and federal agencies. Typically, the data were based on self administered questionnaires completed by all students at the time of registration.

In one instance, researchers identified the presence of a large Indian reservation in Winterhaven, California, a community adjacent to the Colorado River approximately 70 miles from one of the community colleges visited. Nevertheless, respondents at that college indicated that few students from the reservation attended the school. As a result of an interstate agreement between California and Arizona, it appeared that Indians on the reservation could cross the river and enroll at a nearby community college in Arizona located less than 10 miles away.

The Consortium of United Indian Nations identified the majority of its clients (approximately 275) primarily through word of mouth and personal contacts. A small number were identified as well and referred by other local CETA funded agencies in the Bay area, the Department of Employment and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As a result of an intake interview, the counselors at the agency verified each client's eligibility for service and assessed his or her needs; the assessment provided the basis for the development of an employability training plan.

C. PLANNING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR INDIANS.

With respect to local planning for vocational education for Indians at the public schools and at the community colleges, it is accurate to say that none existed. When asked about meeting the special needs of Indians enrolled in their vocational programs, most respondents expressed doubt that any was participating in vocational programs. Even in a community such as Oakland which had a relatively high number of Indian students enrolled in its public schools, few students were enrolled in vocational training and no collaborative planning between the Office of Indian Education and the Department of Vocational Education could be identified. Neither the supervisor of Indian education nor the director of vocational education had initiated contact to discuss issues related to vocational education for Indian students in the high schools. Thus, it appeared that the planning activities conducted by the supervisor of Indian Education were limited primarily to the academic, social and cultural needs of Indian students in the elementary schools rather than those in the high schools.

As suggested by respondents from the LEA as well as from the community-based organization in Oakland, part of the reason why so few Indian students participated in vocational education programs, or any secondary school program, may be cultural. That is, in many cases, Indian students preferred to drop out of school, wait until age 18 and then enroll in vocational programs offered specifically for them through the Consortium rather than participate with other non-Indian students in the high school programs. A considerable number of others returned to the reservation in Alameda County and participated in vocational programs offered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Planning for the activities sponsored by the Consortium was conducted independently by the staff in the five counties based on federal guidelines and the perceived training and employment needs of its clients. Rarely did the staff make use of external expertise or resources in planning the agency's programs. Part of the reason may be due to the fact that the agency primarily acted as a broker paying for services rendered to its clients by other private and public agencies.

D. STRATEGIES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR INDIANS.

As indicated, in no case did we find a separate vocational or support program strategy generated by local assessment of the special needs of Indians in vocational programs either at the LEAs or at the community colleges. The only LEA providing services specifically targeted to Indian students focused its efforts primarily on remediation of academic skills and on reinforcement of cultural awareness.

The administrator responsible for Indian education in Oakland had designed a comprehensive service program using ESEA, Title I, resource staff as well as volunteers from the Inter-Tribal Friendship House, a social service agency in the community. The program provided academic tutoring and cultural awareness classes for approximately 100 Indian students, mostly in the elementary schools. Through the same network, the supervisor had been able to sponsor several parent workshops in the schools to provide information about the various social agencies in the community and the procedures for accessing services. The only effort related to vocational education was a career awareness workshop for some Indian students sponsored in cooperation with the University of California at Berkeley. The school district contributed the cost of transportation as the students needed to be bused to the university for the day.

Another strategy pursued by the supervisor involved working cooperatively with the administrator in charge of the CETA youth employment programs for the district. According to respondents, in the past Indians were not represented adequately among the population of economically disadvantaged students receiving CETA youth services. Presently, an arrangment was worked out with the youth employment program whereby a specific number of slots were reserved for CETA-eligible Indian students in the district. The eligible high school students were trained as tutors by the Indian Education Office to help the younger elementary grade Indian students in various academic areas. The students traveled to the elementary schools and were paid for their service. Moreover, they received elective credit that could be applied toward the high school diploma.

At the community colleges, little or no efforts were made to provide services to Indian students, other than the full array of services provided to all students. A few college administrators, especially in Modesto, California, had attempted to organize student clubs but their efforts had not been successful. Part of the difficulty seemed to be that students were reluctant to identify themselves as Indians, often claiming other nationalities and heritages.

The primary strategy pursued by the CBO in Oakland involved the provision of a range of services to adult Indian persons through the use of external public and private training organizations as well as employers. Some of the services included (1) preparation for GED through the Adult Basic Education Program at the school district, (2) occupational training, primarily in Welding and in office related occupations at some of the private training schools in the area, (3) work experience in social service delivery fields through arrangements with nonprofit organizations including child care centers, hospitals and social service programs, and (4) on-the-job training with a small number of private employers (e.g., the Bell Telephone Company), who were willing to support the agency and also take advantage of the job-targeted tax credits.

In addition to providing clients with a minimum stipend, the CBO paid for tuition costs for the education and training services provided, for books and supplies needed, for transportation and child care, for preventative medical, dental and eye care services and, finally, also contributed 50 percent of the costs for the on-the-job training program. The only services provided by the CBO directly were related to counseling and employability training, particularly for Indian women who were often heads of households and were receiving welfare services.

E. UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR INDIANS.

Neither at the LEAs nor at the community colleges were VEA funds used to support services or activities for Indian students. The funds used to support the Indian education program in Oakland, California, were primarily federal ESEA, Title I, and CETA, Title IV. The supervisor of the program, however, made extensive use of external resources, e.g., volunteers and community service workers from Indian social service agencies in the area.

Similarly, the Consortium of United Indian Nations, although funded totally through CETA, Title III, Section 302, attempted to utilize, whevever possible, external resources to supplement its budget. In most cases, however, the agency needed to reimburse the various outside organizations for services rendered to its clients.

F. EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON INDIANS.

Insofar as the effects of VEA provisions or of VEA funded programs on vocational education options and opportunities for Indian students in the public schools and in the community colleges, it is accurate to maintain that none could be identified, observed or measured. As noted throughout the report, at least for the sample communities included in this study, none of the public secondary or post-secondary educational agencies offered separate programs or supplementary support services to Indian students enrolled in occupational programs, In all cases, respondents maintained that Indian students either did not exist or represented an exceedingly small minority among the community populations served by their educational agencies. Moreover, according to some respondents, even when the population of Indians in the community was relatively high, for a variety of cultural reasons (e.g., reluctance to be identified or labelled, preference for separate, nonpublic programs) beyond their control, few if any were enrolled in vocational programs.

As regards the effects of the services provided to adult Indian persons by the community-based organization in the Northern California Bay area, respondents at the agency were very optimistic. From their perspective, one of the major factors limiting Indians' access to employment in the area, other than adequate basic education skills and job preparation, was the lack of an employment history. Many of the agency's clients came directly from the reservation as part of the Relocation Act. As a result, these individuals had no history of employment and regardless of their skills had difficulty finding jobs. Therefore, the agency, in addition to the variety of support services it could offer, provided the vehicle through which the clients could build a history of work experiences.

CHAPTER NINE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Education Amendments of 1976 mandated that the National Institute of Education undertake a comprehensive study of vocational education programs conducted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, including a review of changes attributed to the 1976 legislation. In response to this Congressional charge, the National Institute of Education outlined a research strategy that combined both intramural and extramural research. Subsequently, the Institute contracted with A. L. Nellum and Associates, Inc., to conduct a study to examine the status of vocational education and services available in local communities for special needs populations identified in federal vocational and related legislation.

B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study, therefore, as specified by the National Institute of Education, was to learn how and to what extent the vocational education needs of special populations--academically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, handicapped, limited-English proficient, women, and Indians--were being met in local communities of different sizes and in different parts of the nation. More specifically, the study attempted to provide information with regard to the following issues:

- Local Policies. The presence and nature of local policies in schools, community colleges, and other community institutions concerning the delivery of vocational and occupational education services to special needs populations.
- Definitions. The definitions, data, and procedures used at the local community level to identify special needs groups, to assess their individual vocational needs and to provide them with vocational training and services.
- Planning. The methods for planning vocational education services and programs at the local level for special needs populations, including who is involved in the planning for the delivery of services; how needs are established and priorities set; and what the strategies are for obtaining and using the special needs funds.
- Strategies. Organizational and instructional strategies within community settings to meet the needs of special populations, such as intervention programs that offer direct educational and

occupational training and related services to the special needs groups as well as those that may indirectly affect the quality of the services provided to those groups.

- Utilization of Resources. Use of resources of various kinds--information, materials, people, and dollars--that are available at the local level to support the various strategies and programs designed to service the special needs populations.

- Effects. Outcomes related to participation in special needs programs, as perceived by respondents in local communities.

- Coordination of Efforts. Extent of collaborative efforts among educational, training, and employment agencies in various communities to provide comprehensive educational and occupational training to special needs groups.

C. METHODOLOGY

Determining how the needs of special populations were being met at the local level was accomplished through a series of site visits and interviews with various respondents in 15 communities. In each of five states visited--California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas--a large metropolitan city, a mid-size community, and a rural area were selected for study. Because the emphasis was on developing a profile of how each community responded to the vocational needs of its special groups, open-ended interviews were conducted with respondents at the following levels: local educational agencies (LEAs), community colleges, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that provided training and employment services to special needs groups or whose representatives acted as advocates for the special populations.

At the LEA level, interviews were conducted with board members, superintendents and their key deputies, directors of vocational education, supervisors in charge of counseling and work-study youth programs, compensatory education, special education, bilingual education, sex equity and, in one district, Indian education. In addition, at the school level, principals, vocational supervisors, teachers, and guidance counselors as well as parents and students contributed information related to the issues of interest to the study.

At the post-secondary levels, respondents included members of boards of trustees, community college presidents, deans of instruction and occupational education, directors, and supervisors of special needs instructional programs (e.g., English as a second language, CETA-supported skills centers, training programs for the handicapped) as well as support service programs (e.g., guidance, financial aid media, and resource centers). In some instances, group rather than individual interviews were conducted because of time and scheduling constraints. Finally, community-based respondents interviewed at each site included minimally a member of the local advisory council for vocational education, often an employer in the community, a representative of the CETA prime sponsor in the area, and a representative of the local office of the Department of Rehabilitation. The number of respondents interviewed affiliated with CBOs providing training and employment services to special groups as well as those acting on their behalf varied considerably depending on the size of the community and the concentration of special needs populations.

Information from each interview was coded and summarized on 5 x 8 data cards according to the six major issues of interest (policy, definition/identification, planning, strategies, resources and effects). The interview teams then wrote individual site profiles that summarized the information obtained from representatives at the public schools, the community college and the CBOs at each site. The final report consists of a third level analysis summarizing and abstracting the major points emerging from the individual site profile reports.

In writing the final report, the primary objectives were to highlight how the key variables in each case combined to produce similar or dissimilar effects. Although this strategy is useful in providing insight into the ways different communities serve the needs of special groups, a word of caution to the reader is appropriate. Because of the small size of the sample and its nonrepresentativeness, it is difficult to tell whether the findings describe unique situations or are representative of patterns that apply to other settings as well.

D. ORGANIZATION OF SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Descriptive reports of the findings related to each of the special needs populations are presented in Chapters Three through Eight. Appended to the report are the findings related to coordination of efforts among public agencies to provide services to special needs populations; seven exemplary collaborative arrangements are described in detail. The major findings and conclusions drawn from the data are categorized by the major issues of interest--local policies, identification, placement, planning, strategies, resources, and effects--and are presented below.

E. MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Local Policies.

The major policy concerns of most LEAs visited were related to equity and quality of educational opportunities for all students, usually defined in terms of academic skills and proficiency requirements for graduation. Rarely did boards of education address policies specifically related to vocational education for students in general or for special needs populations in particular. Where such policies existed, they were usually implicit and in response to federal and state legislative mandates for litigation. However, the state and federal statutes rarely affected local policy development; more often they affected the nature of the administrative and instruction procedures to be followed in identifying and providing services to the special needs groups.

Community college policies, on the other hand, were guided by the philosophy of meeting the post-secondary educational needs of all students. Moreover, because student enrollment in vocational programs often represented 50 percent or more of the total college enrollment, occupational deans and staff were very much involved in the formulation of policies and the development of programs and services to meet the needs of special student populations.

A few of the major findings concerning local policies regarding the provisions of vocational education for special needs populations are presented below.

a. The Priority Concern of Boards of Education Appeared to Be the Development of Minimum Competencies in Academic Areas of Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. Vocational Education, therefore, Was Not a Priority of Most Local School Boards.

Respondents who were in administrative and policymaking roles all stated that the major policy of their respective school districts was "equal educational opportunities." This was defined in terms of the local school board's perception of its role and the mission of the public schools with regard to minimum competencies in basic academic areas. Thus, the major concern of school administrations was to organize services so as to be able to achieve this goal.

Such policies had implications for students who were designated as "special needs" and who wanted to participate in vocational education programs. For example, to the extent that special needs students met the minimum academic standards, usually measured by standardized tests, they could expect to participate in the vocational education programs of their choice. However, to the degree that they displayed serious academic difficulties, they could not participate in vocational education programs unless "special" programs existed to meet their needs and sufficient numbers of slots in the programs were available to accommodate the student demand.

b. Most Policies Regarding Special Needs Populations Were Guided by State and Federal Mandates, Rather Than by Local Initiatives.

Where policies regarding the special needs populations could be identified, they were implicit and usually related to existing state and federal mandates. For example, implicit policies regarding services to special education students emanated from the acceptance by LEAs of the provisions of P. L. 94-142 regarding the education of all handicapped children. Services for handicapped students were arrayed and implemented in accordance with the provisions of this legislation. This was also the case for services provided to academically disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged students, for whom services were provided according to procedures required by ESEA, Title I legislation and CETA-sponsored In-School Youth work experience programs.

In a few instances, policies were also implicitly established as a result of consent decrees when suits had been initiated against local school boards on behalf of certain classes of special needs students. This was the case in New York City regarding the provision of bilingual vocational education services for Hispanic students. However, even in this case, the LEA did not develop an overall policy specific to servicing all of the school-related needs of Hispanic youth; rather, its policy was to follow the requirements of the court's judgment in a particular instance.

c. In Response to Public Pressure Concerning Students' Academic Preparation, Policies and Program Issues Affecting Proficiency Requirements Were Addressed at the Highest District Administrative Levels. Vocational Educators, however, Were Seldom Involved in Such Decision Making Activities.

The special needs subpopulations of greatest concern to LEAs were the academically disadvantaged, then the handicapped. Of lesser concern were the LEP students. There appeared to be little policy concern or initiative affecting services for female students and Indians. With regard to the latter, few if any Indian students were among the populations represented in each of the districts visited.

Given the attention to the academically disadvantaged, whose numbers especially in larger metropolitan areas tended to be sizable, implementation of LEA policies regarding their special needs often resided in the highest administrative offices of the school district. It was not unusual for programs related to compensatory education services or instructional services for the academically disadvantaged to be under the aegis of an assistant or associate superintendent for instruction or curriculum development. Given this locus of responsibility and the nature of the concern, vocational educators were seldom involved in the development of policies regarding these groups, although they were often affected by the implementation of such policies.

For example, as regards the academically disadvantaged, policies of central office staff had direct or indirect effects on vocational education program development. If there was a strong compensatory education thrust within the state and within the LEA, then provisions for compensatory education services took precedence over all other elective programs. Because vocational education was considered an elective, the greater the need for compensatory education services and the larger the population requiring these services, the less opportunity existed for such students to participate in regular vocational education programs. On the other hand, for those who were severely academically disadvantaged, there was often the tendency for central administrators to view vocational education as their only option, since they would probably experience continued failure in regular academic offerings. Hence, under these circumstances, VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantged might be used to provide "separate" and/or "special" vocational education programs for each student.

d. Community College Policies Were Guided by the Philosophy to Meet the Education and Service Needs of Individuals in the Community.

Community colleges, because they viewed their continued existence as interwoven with their ability to demonstrate their responsiveness to their respective local communities, had developed policies that were service-oriented. College administrators, policymakers, and staffs spent considerable time undertaking detailed assessments to identify the needs of the special populations and to ensure that program planning and implementation were commensurate to their service-oriented philosophy. In contrast to the LEAs, community colleges were doing much to make educational equity a reality in terms of access to services for the special needs populations. In addition, personnel of community colleges often participated in policy development for other community-based organizations or areas such as CETA and local and state advisory councils for vocational education but were seldom involved in polcy formulation on LEA boards.

e. Community-Based Groups and CETA Were Especially Committed to the Needs of Special Needs Populations.

Community-based organizations were committed to addressing the employment and education needs of some or all of the subgroups of the special needs populations. This was especially true of CETA programs, whose focus, though on income and employment status, cut across the various special needs subpopulations of this study. In each instance, researchers were able to identify policies addressing the need for some form of career/occupational/vocational training as a condition for securing competitive employment. While many of the community-based organizations were linked to the CETA system as subcontractors, few used any VEA funds for services provision. According to some respondents who had attempted to tap this source of funding, the application process was so unwieldy as to discourage, rather than encourage, their efforts.

2. Definitions, Identification, and Placement.

A central finding of the study with regard to LEA definitions of special needs populations eligible for vocational education programs was that the established procedures used to identify the populations provided the sole basis for defining their needs. In most all instances, however, these procedures were very largely shaped by state and federal legislations unrelated to the specific provisions of the national VEA. Rarely did the LEAs initiate identification or assessment procedures of students' needs after the students had been placed in the regular vocational education programs. As a result, the services provided to the special needs populations could not be referenced to the specific problems the special needs students needed to overcome in order to succeed in the regular program.

In contrast to the LEAs, at the community colleges, the identification of special needs students occurred on two levels--before and after their placement in regular occupational programs. Thus, the opportunities existed at the community colleges for providing to special needs students vocationally related services and programs designed to meet their specific needs. Following are some of the major findings.

a. Procedures for Identification of Special Need Students in Most School Districts Were Determined by State and Federal Categorical Legislation and Not by the Federal Vocational Education Amendments.

The procedures inherent in the differing state and federal categorical aid legislations determined the procedures for identifying the various subsets of special needs populations. For example, identification of the academically disadvantaged students was determined in most cases by procedures prescribed by ESEA Title I legislation, as well as state compensatory aid legislation, especially in states that had instituted proficiency testing. For the economically disadvantaged, identification was according to eligibility guidelines set in the CETA legislation; for the handicapped, it was according to P.L. 94-142, which detailed the processes for definition, identification, placement, planning, and evaluation for all handicapped children.

None of these individual pieces of state and federal legislation addressed the issue of vocational education, though each did address a subset of the special needs population targeted to receive services and was referenced by the vocational education legislation. The result of this referencing process, however, was that the vocational education needs were not identified. Rather, contrary to the intent of the VEA that services be provided to increase the prospects for success in regular vocational education programs, issues addressed by the varying identification processes focused on the academic and other non-work-related needs of the special groups.

b. In Most Cases, Procedures for Defining and Identifying Special Needs Students Were Instituted Before Students Were Eligible for Vocational Education Programs and Before They Indicated Interest in Such Programs.

Most of the state and federal categorical aid legislation referenced in the VEA required that special needs students be identified in the early grades as a condition for receipt of services. Thus, for example, students eligible for remedial reading and math instruction were usually identified by Grade 2; those defined as economically disadvantaged were identified once application had been made for free lunch; usually upon entry to elementary school in Kindergarten or Grade 1; identification of handicapped students in many LEAs was undertaken at or before entry into Kindergarten or Grade 1. The same was true for LEP students, where, in most cases, school districts focused their efforts on providing bilingual instruction at the elementary grade level. Hence, because of the procedures prescribed for by the various legislations, the special needs populations had been identified well in advance of consideration for placement in vocational education programs and long before the students had declared an interest in participating in vocational education programs.

c. Rarely Did LEAs Identify Special Needs Populations and Assess Their Vocational Education Needs After Placement in Regular Programs.

In general, placement of special needs populations in regular vocational programs was related to their success in academic programs, not by assessments of their work- and employment-related skills. In most instances, placement of special needs populations appeared to be contingent on performance in basic competency areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Students who failed to achieve a level of acceptable competency in these basic skills were placed in compensatory or remedial programs. Such placement usually negated the possibility of participation of subgroups of special needs students in regular vocational education programs. Or, to the contrary, if these subgroups were viewed as not being capable of achieving success in regular academic or vocational programs, they might be placed in "separate" or "special" vocational programs.

Rarely did LEAs consider in the placement process factors such as students' vocational competencies and interests first and academic achievement second. As a result, the use of other than VEA legislatively prescribed procedures conflicted with the intended outcome of the vocational education legislation to provide services needed to overcome "handicaps which prevent success in regular vocational education programs."

d. Except for Female Students, the Process of Defining and Identifying Some Subgroups of the Special Needs Populations Was Fraught With Confusion and Imprecision.

A number of limitations were noted concerning procedures and instruments currently used to define and identify some subgroups of the special needs populations. This was particularly the case for students who had serious academic problems and those with limited proficiency in English.

Concerning the severely academically disadvantaged students, it appeared that school administrators were often uncertain about their identification and placement. The degree to which the students also manifested social, behavorial, and emotional problems exacerbated the difficulties. Thus, for example, students most likely to be identified as "educationally handicapped" might be considered by some LEAs as "academically disadvantaged" and receive services, under ESEA, Title I, but as "handicapped" (learning disabled or even educable mentally retarded) and receive services under P.L. 94-142 by another. Equally noteworthy was the fact that many students particularly affected by this apparent confusion concerning definition seemed to be minority males, usually Black and Hispanic.

With regard to limited-English proficient students, researchers were presented with two conflicting sets of claims, particularly concerning Hispanic students, but insufficient evidence to support either. School administrators claimed that there was no need for bilingual vocational programs at the high school level because Hispanic students graduating from the elementary and junior high schools knew enough English to follow the regular vocational curriculum. They saw this as an outcome of their K through 9 bilingual education and ESL programs, where ESEA, Title VII, resources were coordinated. In addition, school administrators often claimed that the resident Hispanic community tended to be stable and, given the continuity of bilingual education services in the elementary grades, their programs achieved the goals of English language proficiency.

Some advocates for the Hispanic community, on the other hand, claimed that bilingual vocational education programs were very much needed and pointed to the high dropout rates among Hispanic youth at the high school level as an indicator for such need. They also noted that ESL instructions had to be provided by many CETA and other community-based programs serving the employment and training needs of Hispanic citizens.

Insufficient data were available to support either claim. For example, in some school districts, where the Hispanic population was heavily concentrated, there were indications that the dropout rate among Hispanic youth was gradually decreasing, rather than increasing. On the other hand, because CETA has a minimum age requirement for out-of-school youth, there was no way to identify which of the Hispanic youth serviced by the various CETA-sponsored programs were both long-time residents of the city and former students in the local school system who dropped out because of language-related difficulties.

Complicating the problem of identification for the LEP population was the fact that, in some sites, testing was done in English only, not in both in English and the students' native languages. As a result, school administrators often identified LEP students as "academically disadvantaged" when their performance in English reading, writing, and mathematics was below the minimum requirements. Often, these students would be programmed then for compensatory and remedial classes with other native English-speaking students. Hence, it was not unusual that, especially in large metropolitan areas, classes of students identified as "academically disadvantaged" were heavily minority persons, racially and ethnically.

e. At the Community College Level, the Process of Definition, Identification, and Placement Occurred at Two Stages: Before and After Entry.

Unlike procedures in most secondary schools, placement in programs at the community colleges usually occurred at two stages. For most students, identification of special needs and initial placement in programs occurred at the point of entry to the college. Generally, based on review of records and performance on entrance exams, students were advised of their status at the time of acceptance of the application for admission. For those with serious needs, e.g., the academically disadvantaged, many were urged to attend pre-entrance programs that might be beneficial. Moreover, the students were assigned to a guidance counselor, who, at the time of entry, reviewed with the student his or her interests, performance on standardized measures such as the SAT and ACT, and other appropriate data, in order to identify the best match of courses, curricula, and instructors.

In addition, a "back-up" system existed for students who were "transfers," late applicants, and those experiencing difficulty shortly after placement in academic and occupational classes. Students had the option of altering their programs or seeking individualized help provided through the college resource centers. Typically, the guidance and counseling process for the special needs populations provided specialized assistance to the students in an attempt to address their specific and individualized needs. For example, guidance strategies for female students were specific to the age and career interests of the students. Older women who were employed but needed additional education for upward mobility would be provided services quite different from those available to younger women with no work experience or older women who had been removed from the labor force for extended periods of time and were now heads of households.

f. Community-Based and CETA-Sponsored Organizations Defined and Identified Their Clients According to Federal Legislation.

Organizations providing services to special needs popualtions linked to the CETA system and the state Departments of Rehabilitation defined and identified their clientele according to provisions of their respective Federal legislation. However, such agencies were very concerned about evaluation of the services provided and the ability of the community-based organizations to place clients successfully in jobs. Program directors and program staff indicated that, although the sponsoring agencies provided support for their efforts, the overemphasis on "successful" placements forced subcontractors to screen out clients who were least likely to succeed in order to achieve their placement goals and be eligible for continued funding.

As long as the total population eligible for services was greater than those for whom services would be provided, most subcontractors could easily comply with the differing federal regulations and at the same time meet the evaluation criteria applied by the state and local administering agencies. However, the increased focus on effectiveness as measured by successful placements regardless of other functions such as clients' readiness for training and employment led to differentiations among eligible populations based on academic considerations.

3. Planning

At the LEA level, planning activities for participation in vocational education programs occurred at two levels: the central administrative level and at the local school building level. At the central administrative level, activities were planned for the entire district. Such activities involved attention to the numbers and kinds of offerings available to students within the various units (local schools); the types, number, and quality of the teaching staff; the availability of equipment and other materials necessary to support instruction; and the policies regarding entrance into programs. At the local school building level, individual projects would be operated, and the allocated programs, courses, and activities would be established.

Concerning special needs populations, the planning activities at most LEAs were related primarily to the schools' efforts to meet the needs of the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped. Moreover, for each of these groups, the activities as well as the key participants involved in the planning process differed depending on the state requirements for funding, the number of special needs students, and the amount of resources available to meet their needs as well as the districts' policy toward providing separate vocational options for them. In general, however, the planning process at the LEA level was of a short-term nature and lacked the coordination between people and programs that was often evident at the community college level. Some of the major findings are presented below.

a. The Absence of LEA Planning Activities for Participation of LEP, Women, Indians, and the Economically Disadvantaged in Vocational Education Programs Was Noted at Some Sites.

Planning activities at almost every LEA visited focused almost exclusively on two of the special needs categories of students: the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped. In general, there was little or no evidence of planning activities related to participation of the other subgroups of special needs populations in vocational education programs.

Although most school districts had a Sex Equity Director, usually more than one responsibility was assigned to those individuals; issues related to equity were considered secondary to their other roles. Moreover, school administrators' attitudes were that "aggressive" outreaching to female students to participate in "nontraditional" vocational education programs (and vice versa for male students) would alienate local residents who were always described as "conservative." Paradoxically, often male and female students were participating in "nontraditional" vocational education programs in areas described as "conservative," that is, in rural and midsize communities. Typically, the reasons offered by school administrators for this phenomenon were related to the need for "survival": female students needed the "nontraditional" skills to survive in the isolated areas, far removed from ready access to services; male students needed the "nontraditional" homemaking skills to survive on college campuses and in independent living quarters while they pursued higher education.

With regard to LEP students, bilingual administrators seemed to be more concerned with the institutionalization of bilingual academic programs than the establishment of separate bilingual vocational programs. Vocational educators, on the other hand, pointed to the lack of resources, especially qualified bilingual vocational staff, to plan and develop special programs for LEP students. They also noted that most LEP students in their districts knew enough English by the time they reached the high school level to participate in the regular English monolingual programs successfully.

At each of the sites visited, the population of Indian students was very small. Therefore, little or no planning activities were directed toward this special needs group. Even at the one site where officials acknowledged the presence of such population, the major planning focus was on academically and culturally related activities targeted to students in the elementary grades.

Finally, some planning activities were evident for the economically disadvantaged subgroup of students. However, planning was related primarily to the operation of the work experience programs under the In-School Youth Programs funded by CETA. It should be noted, however, that almost all of these programs were very small, usually accommodating a few students per school (five to ten), and seldom providing slots sufficient to meet the demands of all students who were economically disadvantaged and needed to work. In addition, in some cases, the activities involved were less "planning" than monitoring/supervision of in-school youth at work sites in the schools; local CETA Youth officials generally planned the activities with a district representative, which were then conveyed to the local school building administrators.

b. At the LEA Level, Planning for the Use of VEA Set-Asides for the Disadvantaged Focused Almost Exclusively on the Needs of the Academically Disadvantaged; However, Such Planning Was Undertaken Independent of Any Activities Supported by Other Categorical Aid Programs for the Disadvantaged--State or Federal.

Partly because the size of the academically disadvantaged tended to be very large and, because LEA policies stressed the development of basic skills proficiency standards, when school administrators talked about the "disadvantaged," invariably they meant the "academically disadvantaged."

VEA set-asides for the "disadvantaged," therefore, were used to develop support activities consistent with these local priorities. However, VEA-supported programs developed for these students were planned by vocational educators, usually independent of any planning undertaken by central office administrators who administered other state and federal compensatory education funds for the disadvantaged. At none of the sites visited were vocational educators at the district level involved in planning activities required for the administration of such programs. Thus, the efforts, although directed toward the same target populations, were usually separate and uncoordinated.

Planning activities related to the use of the VEA set-asides for the disadvantaged occurred at two levels: central administration and the local school building site. At central headquarters, vocational educators had major administrative responsibility for establishing program priorities and developing strategies for the distribution of the funds. These activities were accomplished in several ways. Typically, the director of vocational education worked with a committee of high school principals or departmental chairs, as well as vocational educational subject matter supervisors to plan for the administrative use of the VEA funds, including the categorical funds for the disadvantaged. Priorities were generally established according to a variety of factors: state guidelines, student interests, review of economic projections regarding local employment potential in vocational areas, and recommendations of the local advisory groups, the general council for vocational education and the individual craft committees.

Funds were distributed in a variety of ways. In some of the larger metropolitan school districts with many units (local school buildings and/or programs), schools would develop proposals for funding that were reviewed competitively by the central vocational administrative office. Alternatively, in districts where special or separate programming existed for academically disadvantaged students, the funds were usually used to support the vocational options available to students in those centers. Finally, the most typical strategy was to divide the funds equitably among the various high schools that offered vocational courses. In such cases, the distribution of funds was based on enrollment, academic performance of students, vocational programs available in the schools, and the condition of existing equipment.

At the local building level, program planning for use of the VEA set-aside for the disadvantaged was usually under the leadership of the building principal. Here, the principal usually worked with the chair of the vocational education department and vocational education teachers, as well as the vocational guidance counselors, in planning for actual use of the funds. In general, the building principals had a great deal of flexibility and authority regarding these planning activities as well as the allocation of funds. The only requirement was that the school be able to document the number of academically disadvantaged students who benefited from the activities supported by VEA funds.

c. When Planning for the Use of the VEA Set-Aside for the Handicapped, There Was Evidence of Some Collaboration Between Vocational Educators and Special Education Administrators.

Unlike the planning efforts for the "disadvantaged," which were often characterized as independent and at times redundant, planning efforts for the handicapped population tended to display some collaboration between vocational educators and special education administrators. The planning process usually began when vocational educators in central administrative offices informed the special education administrators of the size of the allocations of the set-asides for the handicapped population.

Special education administrators, working with building principals, would then plan separately for the use of these funds and, later, would meet with vocational educators to review the plans and to discuss issues concerning their implementation. Because special educators were responsible for administration of P.L. 94-142 funds, often VEA-related programs were coordinated with support services already available in the schools. Depending on the nature of the VEA programs proposed for handicapped students, discussions with the vocational education director and supervisors might focus on (1) recruitment of vocational educators for the separate vocational programs, (2) purchase of new shop equipment or modification of existing equipment for the programs, and (3) allocation of space and the organization of the separate shop facilities in the schools. To summarize, interactions between vocational and special education administrators were most apparent during the program implementation phase rather than during the needs assessment or program development phases.

In general, there was little outside agency participation in the planning activities as they related to LEA vocational education services for the handicapped population. The exception, however, was the role of the Vocational Rehabilitation Agency representative. This was particularly the case if vocational rehabilitation funds were being used for the students. Moreover, when LEAs were required to submit proposals to the state in order to receive VEA funding, often local representatives from the Department of Rehabilitation had to review the proposal and indicate approval of the planned use of the funds as evidenced by their signatures.

d. At the Local Building Level, Special Education Staff Spent Much Time Educating Staff of the Need for Their Cooperation in Providing Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped.

At the local building level, special education adminstrators and coordinators spent much of their time educating school administrators of the need for their cooperation and assistance in operating special programs for the handicapped. As indicated, school principals had much authority and control over the types of programs operated in their buildings. Often, the reason for the absence of handicapped students in many vocational education programs was the reluctance of principals and school staff to "mainstream" handicapped students in the regular vocational programs. In most cases, health and safety factors were cited as the primary considerations; school staff feared that handicapped students were more prone to injury and, therefore, required more attention in machine shops than nonhandicapped students.

Once the school admitted handicapped students, according to the requirements of P.L. 94-142, a committee for the handicapped was established. Hence, program planning for handicapped students at the school level focused on developing Individualized Education Plans for the students and monitoring those plans. Teachers and school support staff most directly involved with education of handicapped students were the key participants in this planning process.

e. Participation of LACVEs in Planning for the Participation of Special Needs Populations in Vocational Education Programs Was Limited and Specific.

Researchers were able to identify LACVEs at all sites and to gain some knowledge of their participation in the overall operation of vocational education programs at local sites. Generally, the roles played by the LACVEs were limited and specific. Essentially, they provided vocational educators with detailed information about employment projections for local industries and about related projected manpower needs; they were also very useful in placing students in vocational work experience and work training programs. Indeed, in some of the highly technical areas, LACVE members, many of whom were employers or employer representatives, often provided long-term employment to the better students, as a result of the students' performances during the work experience duration. This was both a compliment and a consternation to many of the vocational educators who were proud of the accomplishment of their "star" pupils, on the one hand, but concerned about the reduction of the number of slots for placement in work experience, on the other.

f. Participation of Advocates for the Special Needs Populations on the LACVEs Was Negligible.

Although the VEA legislation calls for broad representation of the local community on the LACVEs, researchers rarely found such representation. In general, those represented tended to come from the employment, labor and post-secondary vocational communities. Often there was representation from the local CETA prime sponsor. However, rarely was there representation from advocacy groups for the special needs populations.

In addition, there was little involvement in the planning process of the LEA for special needs populations regarding vocational education programs. As stated above, at the central administrative level, planning for use of the set-aside for the "disadvantaged" was undertaken almost exclusively by central office vocational educators; for the handicapped, there was joint planning to some degree by central administrative special education administrators and vocational educators. There was little or no planning for use of VEA set-asides for any of the other special needs populations. At the school building level, outside participation in the planning related to vocational education in general, and vocational education for any of the special needs populations was limited to parental and community participation through the local PTA. Then, such participation was a function of the relationship between the local PTA and the school administration.

g. The Planning Process for the Provision of Vocational Education Services to the Special Needs Populations at the Community College Level Was Expansive and Extensive, Involving a Cross Section of the Community College Staff and Administration and a Cross Section of Representation From the Local Community.

Vocational education program planning for special needs populations within community colleges tended to be characterized by collaborative efforts among staff and between the college community and the local community.

Within the college itself, the needs assessment process tended to be ongoing. Thus, as problems were identified, the cross section of the college community involved in their potential resolution would be requested to assist in helping to find solutions. Given these procedures, most colleges had developed core programs that were seen as "essential" to meeting the basic needs of the various sets of special needs populations (e.g., remedial classes for the academically disadvantaged, financial aid for the economically disadvantaged, support services and outreach for the handicapped, etc.); these were augmented with auxiliary and ancillary services needs categories (e.g., displaced homemaker programs for older women who were single heads of households, readers for the handicapped who were blind, etc.). The collaborative process required that all participants keep each other informed of the newly identified needs of the various special needs populations as well as the services and programs available to meet those needs.

In addition, community colleges made extensive use of representatives from the local communities as advisors to each of their departments and special committees. This local representation was important in terms of the college's demonstration of its responsiveness to the local community, whose tax dollars paid for part of its support, as well as a means of tapping the various information bases about possible alternatives for problem resolution. Representation on the various advisory boards tended to include groups and agencies as diverse as the local CETA prime sponsor, state Department of Rehabilitation, the employment community, labor, community-based advocacy groups for the disadvantaged, women, minorities, and the handicapped.

h. Planning Activities on the Part of Community-Based Groups Occurred Independently of Planning for Special Needs Populations by LEAs and Community Colleges.

Community-based organizations usually planned their activities according to a set of specific factors: clients' needs, employment needs/projections for the service area in which they were located, and requirements prescribed either by legislation, if a CETA-sponsored organization, or by their charter and/or Board of Directors, if a private, nonprofit organization.

For CETA-sponsored organizations, planning activities occurred at two levels: the prime sponsor and organization. At the prime sponsor level, planning activities focused on the quantity and quality of the clientele serviced, procedures for identifying planning priorities, strategies for distributing funds, and processes for evaluating organizational efforts. Most prime sponsor representatives interviewed stated that, in planning for their operations, they attempted to incorporate the participation of a broad spectrum of the local community to ensure that the needs of the various sets of special needs populations would be addressed within the organization structure. The local Employment Development and Training Councils were the forums in which this cross-spectrum was represented and involved employers, labor, industry, public service organizations, post-secondary institutions, and the local education agencies.

At the second level of the CETA system, individual organizations planned for the delivery of service to the various clients who came to them. Most had their independent Board of Directors to which they were responsible, and many of the boards played an active role in planning the variety of programs to be operated for their constituencies. At this level, organizations focused on the specifics of client identification and outreach, assessment of individual client needs, tailoring of services to client needs, job placement, and administrative issues such as payment of stipends, submission of reports in a timely manner to the prime sponsor, and the prime sponsor's evaluation of the services provided by the organization.

Very often, as stated above, the local community college was contracted by the prime sponsor to provide coordinated services delivery to special needs populations in a given area. This was especially true for the Indian River Community College in St. Lucie County, Florida, and in California at the Peralta Community College District in Oakland.

4. Strategies.

The major findings related to how communities provided vocational education programs and services to the special needs populations are presented separately for (1) local education agencies, (2) community colleges, and (3) community-based organizations.

Local Educational Agencies

a. Except for Female Students Who Were Usually Enrolled in Business and Commercial Vocational Programs, Participation of Special Needs Populations in Regular Vocational Education Programs Was Very Low.

Two observations with regard to vocational strategies for serving special needs populations at the LEA level were consistent across sites.

First, the number of special needs students participating in regular vocational education programs was relatively small and, second, VEA special needs strategies of school districts affected only two of the special needs groups identified in the federal legislation--the academically disadvantaged and the handicapped. Essentially, no VEA-related strategies could be identified for economically disadvantaged students, limited-English proficient students, women, or Indians. The reasons for these patterns of behavior differed, however, depending on the special needs groups. These are summarized below.

Academically Disadvantaged. In general, two separate groups of academically disadvantaged students were identified, especially in large metropolitan and mid-size communities: (1) those who were slightly below national norms on standardized tests and (2) those who were severely academically disadvantaged; that is, students who were three or more years below grade level, had been retained in grades, and had exhibited discipline or behavior problems and who were very likely to drop out of school before graduation.

With regard to the former population of students, many of the districts' new academic course and proficiency standards for graduation as well as the technical vocational program entry requirements tended to exclude students from participating in regular vocational programs. Many of these "borderline" academically disadvantaged students, if they wanted to obtain a regular high school diploma, were forced to drop vocational education to take additional remedial academic courses in an effort to pass the proficiency exams.

Options for the more severely academically disadvantaged students were more clearly defined. Typically, they were excluded from regular vocational education courses. In districts in which separate vocationally oriented programs were available, students were counseled and placed in these alternative programs, which, in most cases, did not lead to a regular diploma. Moreover, although often the alternative vocational programs were more relevant to their needs than most academic courses, the vocational options available were more limited than the district's regular vocational programs.

Separate, alternative programs, often supported with VEA set-aside funds for the disadvantaged, were not offered in every school district, however. In general, these programs seemed to be available in the larger LEAs, particularly in those states that provided categorical funds for compensatory and alternative programs for academically disadvantaged students. In school districts where such funds and programs were not available, severely academically disadvantaged students seemed to be placed in general curriculum courses rather than vocational or academic. Many of these students were apt to drop out of school before graduation and were likely candidates for the CETA training and employment programs in the community.

Economically Disadvantaged. Economically disadvantaged students participated in regular vocational education programs to the extent that they could meet the districts' academic graduation standards and vocational program entry requirements. None of the school districts visited offered VEA-related instructional programs or guidance services designed to help economically disadvantaged students overcome the effects of their condition. Often, the reason indicated for the lack of such programs was the size of the academically disadvantaged student population in the school. Because the VEA set-aside allocation for disadvantaged students was generally small and the needs of the academically disadvantaged students were so great, most all of the districts' VEA categorical funds targeted to the disadvantaged were used to supplement services to the academically disadvantaged. Respondents typically noted that many who were academically disadvantaged were also economically disadvantaged. Thus, in effect, they were serving the needs of this population as well.

The only option generally available to economically disadvantaged students was work experience programs funded primarily through CETA youth programs and, in a few cases, VEA funds. The number of slots available in most cases was less than the eligible population. Moreover, the purposes of the programs were to provide world-of-work experiences to the students and a stipend to encourage the students to graduate from high school. Most of the students were placed in low-skill, low-paying jobs. In a few cases, the programs offered career guidance and employability skills. Rarely, however, did the employment programs provide skill training, or were related to the regular vocational courses.

Handicapped. The most prevalent strategy for servicing handicapped students was to place them in separate programs that had been established by most school districts for students who exhibited certain types of disabilities. Two types of programs were identified: academic and vocational self-contained programs within the comprehensive high schools for minimally handicapped students (primarily the educable mentally retarded) and self-contained programs in separate centers for the severely (the trainable mentally retarded) and multiple-handicapped students. In a few instances, a third strategy was identified, which involved provision of resource laboratory type services to "mainstreamed" learning disabled and some emotionally impaired students.

Typically, handicapped students were categorized on the basis of a formal identification process and were then channeled automatically into one of these program options. In effect, then, the placement process depended more on group classification of the students' disabilities than on individual assessments of vocational strengths and interests. In all cases, the vocational options available to handicapped students in the separate programs were more limited than the offerings available to nonhandicapped students in regular programs. Moreover, the occupational options available to students in the separate programs varied from site to site depending on the programs' vocational orientation. In some cases, where the vocational courses were taught by certified vocational teachers, there appeared to be serious efforts to provide handicapped students with salable entry-level skills. Conversely, when the separate programs were staffed totally by non-vocationally oriented teachers, the focus was on helping students develop academic competencies and appropriate general work habits rather than specific occupational skills. Consistent with this philosophy, preparation for employment consisted solely of world-of-work experiences typically unrelated to occupational training.

The small numbers of handicapped students "mainstreamed" into regular vocational programs were mostly the physically disabled whose disabilities did not impair their ability to perform in the classroom or shop. In addition, a few sensory disabled, particularly the hard-of-hearing and some students who had language impairments, were "mainstreamed" in certain vocational programs, such as Welding, where their handicaps did not interfere with the task requirements.

Perhaps the least well served handicapped students were the learning disabled and the emotionally impaired. In addition to the difficulties in identifying and assessing their needs, school administrators had considerable difficulties related to appropriate school and program placement. Often, when supplemental resource type services were not available in the high schools, these students were placed inappropriately in the self-contained separate programs housed in the comprehensive high schools. Rarely were these students "mainstreamed" into the regular vocational classes since vocational educators seemed to be particularly careful to screen out potential troublemakers who might create disruptive situations.

Limited-English Proficient. With regard to this population, respondents across sites noted that few LEP students participated in the regular vocational classes because the total population attending the high schools was small. They argued that LEP students who had graduated from elementary and junior high school bilingual programs knew enough English at the time they entered high schools to be able to follow successfully the monolingual English vocational curricula. Because most of these students were no longer identified as LEP, special services or programs for them were not necessary.

Community advocates for LEP populations put forth a counter argument, however. They suggested that participation of LEP students in regular programs was low because many of these students dropped out of high school before graduation since special services or programs were not available to them. Moreover, when such programs were available to a few districts, participation of LEP students in them restricted their ability to enroll in the regular vocational programs. Often, because the secondary bilingual programs were offered in a few schools only, the students' vocational options were limited to programs offered at such schools.

Women. Although all school district representatives noted that there were no sex restrictions affecting student placement into any of their vocational curriculum courses, with a few exceptions, most of the female students seemed to be participating in traditionally female-oriented courses. None of the LEAs visited had made concerted district-wide efforts to encourage female participation in nontraditional programs. Thus, although each district appeared to comply with federal and state sex equity guidelines, the strategy used was clearly passive. Respondents at various sites pointed to the conservative nature of their constituents, and most feared the consequences likely to result from taking a more active role on this sensitive issue.

A few LEAs, cooperating with the community college in their district, provided workshops for graduating female students in an effort to disseminate information about opportunities for vocational education in nontraditional areas at the college. In most cases, however, arrangements seemed to have been initiated by representatives of the community colleges rather than by those at the LEAs.

Indians. Except for one, none of the LEAs visited had a substantial number of Indian students enrolled in the schools. Even in the one district that was the exception, however, most of the students enrolled seemed to be concentrated in the elementary grades rather than the high schools. Therefore, no VEA-related strategy existed to provide services to this special needs population. According to the Indian education director, many of the students dropped out of high school before graduating and either returned to the reservation nearby or sought services from the few community-based agencies that had been established specifically to serve their needs.

b. Special Needs Vocational Education Programs in the LEAs Were Usually Separate From the Regular Programs. Rarely Did LEAs Use VEA-Supported Program Strategies and Services for Special Needs Students "Mainstreamed" in the Regular Vocational Programs.

The strategy of separate special needs programs was most clearly identified with respect to handicapped students. In every instance in which an LEA was allotted VEA set-aside funds for the handicapped, school personnel could identify separate special needs projects that were supported, often initiated, with the vocational funds. In many cases, the funds had been used by special education administrators as an incentive to principals for establishing vocationally oriented programs for handicapped students in their schools. Thus, although the purpose of the strategies was not to supplement services to "mainstreamed" handicapped students, the effect was to increase the vocational education opportunities for some of the handicapped students in the districts.

Strategies to (1) increase representation of handicapped students in the regular vocational programs or (2) provide supplementary services to those who were already participating in regular programs were very rare. Nevertheless, such VEA-related strategies were observed in a few school districts. The establishment of vocational evaluation centers supported with VEA funds was an example of local attempts on the part of some educators to increase the participation of the more able handicapped students in the regular programs. By providing objective assessments of students' strengths and vocational interests, as well as specifying in a "vocational plan" the types of instructional and other support services that were needed by the students for success and were available in the district, some special educators hoped to modify the attitudes of the school staff and thus to facilitate placement of those students in the regular classes.

Finally, an example of a VEA strategy to provide supplementary services to handicapped students in regular programs was observed in one LEA only. This was a school district that was hiring interpreters for a group of hard-of-hearing students in one of the district's skill centers. In general, however, there appeared to be some reluctance on the part of LEAs to use the VEA funds to provide supplementary or support services since many felt that such services were funded adequately through other state and federal special education programs.

With regard to VEA services to academically disadvantaged students, the second special needs population typically served by most LEAs, the strategies were less clear. In the case of school districts that offered separate alternative programs, VEA funds were usually used to support program activities in those centers. Decisions related to the expenditure of funds were made by local administrators, although, in most cases, it appeared that the funds contributed to the purchase of materials and equipment for the vocational shops.

In cases where the funds were distributed to the various high schools on the basis of factors such as total vocational enrollment, academic achievement of students, etc., the principals and school vocational staff often determined how the funds were to be used. Thus, the strategies used varied considerably and included purchasing material and equipment for individualized instructions, hiring school aides, and, in some cases, hiring or supporting teachers of remedial reading and math. Often, in such cases, teachers provided remedial reading and math instructions to academically disadvantaged students in vocational as well as other curriculum courses. As a result, most schools followed the practice of documenting, for auditing purposes, the nature of the services provided to academically disadvantaged students enrolled in vocational programs. In fact, similar procedures were used by many LEAs, particularly those in states allocating funds on the basis of services rendered to disadvantaged vocational students rather than on a project-by-project basis. One of the important conclusions that could be drawn from the findings concerning services to academically disadvantaged students is that few LEAs had adopted vocationally-related strategies for serving this population based on individual needs assessments of language and quantitative skills related to the specific occupational requirements.

c. Vocational Education Programs for Special Needs Populations Generally Included Some Form of Work Experience.

Most of the LEAs visited had adopted work experience as a strategy for vocational education for special needs populations. These programs, however, were not usually related to the cooperative vocational education programs most schools also administered as part of their regular vocational programs. Typically, work experience programs were designed to orient the special needs students to the general world of work, often placing students in positions unrelated to their specific areas of training.

Moreover, some of the work experience programs provided special needs students structured and supervised experiences. That is, agreements among the students, the school, and the employers were signed; specific objectives and skills to be learned were identified; and individual student progress was monitored. In other cases, however, none of these procedures was followed, and the programs seemed to lack direction. These observations were noted in relation to both programs for the disadvantaged and those for the handicapped. Often, the quality of the programs depended on whether (1) a job counselor or developer was specifically assigned to the program by the school district to secure placement for the special needs students and to monitor their progress, and (2) the special needs programs were vocationally oriented; that is, the programs, staffed by vocational educators, focused on teaching occupational skills to special needs students rather than world-of-work experiences only.

d. Staff Development Programs and Curriculum/Instructional Modifications Were Rarely Used as Strategies for Serving Special Needs Students.

In the case of staff development programs, none of the LEAs visited had opted to develop systematic and comprehensive in-service training programs for vocational education teachers as a strategy for meeting the needs of special populations participating in vocational training. In a few cases, workshops emphasizing appropriate strategies for teaching vocational skills to handicapped students were sponsored by state vocational departments. When those workshops were attended by a few LEA teachers, their travel and per diem expenses were paid with VEA funds targeted for such purposes.

Curriculum modifications were, in most cases, limited to the initiatives of individual teachers. In only two of the 15 cases were systematic attempts made at the LEA level to modularize the vocational education curricula so that special needs students could participate and master skills at their own learning pace without being constrained by an "all or none" philosophy or requirement. It should be noted, however, that, in most sites visited, the state agencies, working with local universities, had assumed responsibility for revising and developing competency-based vocational curricula. For each of the offerings, the LEAs were required to follow each state's curriculum scope and sequence in order to receive funding and certification. In this respect, vocational teachers tended to be reluctant to modify the state curriculum requirements for special needs populations since a major criterion for state assessment of the programs was based on the percentage of "successful placements" of graduates. As a result, teachers placed particular emphasis on students' acquisition of all required entry-level occupational skills.

e. Rarely Did LEAs Seek the Assistance of External Agencies or Resources as a VEA-Related Strategy to Serve the Needs of Special Populations.

In general, except for (1) the contractual agreements with CETA for In-School Youth Programs for economically disadvantaged students and (2) the nonfinancial arrangements with local Departments of Rehabilitation allowing counselors access to handicapped students' school reocords, few LEAs sought the assistance of outside public or private organizations including the community colleges, in planning or implementing VEA programs for special needs students. In the larger metropolitan cities, some of the LEAs attempted to forge new relationships with employers in the community, such as Oakland's Adopt-A-School Program. Nevertheless, the efforts were usually not coordinated with the district VEA activities for the special needs populations.

Community Colleges

a. At Community Colleges, the Major Strategy Was to Mainstream as Many of the Special Needs Populations as Possible and to Provide Support Services Based on the Students' Needs.

Based on the overall analysis, the most prevalent community college strategy for providing services to special needs populations was through the colleges' established student support systems. These included financial and career guidance and placement centers, guidance departments, the media, resource and tutorial centers, student activity offices, health centers, and, in most colleges, the recently formed exceptional student centers. Often, the deans of occupational education using the VEA set-aside funds would contribute to the activities provided through the centers so that particular attention was given by the staff to the special needs of the target students enrolled in occupational programs.

Through the student support centers, a variety of support types of activities were available to special needs college students who either requested such services or were referred to the centers by the instructional staff. Some of the services available included media-based individualized instructions, educational tutoring, and small group classes for the academically disadvantaged; financial aid and work-study programs for the economically disadvantaged; counseling, mobility aides, interpreters, note takers, reader services, and so forth for the handicapped; English as a Second Language training, bilingual tutors, and curricular materials appropriate for the limited-English proficient; and peer counseling and employability skill classes for women, particularly displaced homemakers who had a need to enter or reenter the labor market. Although the services were grouped by special populations, they were available to any student at the college who requested or had a need for them.

b. Separate Programs for Special Needs Populations Were Also Identified at the Community College Level.

Two types of separate programs for special needs populations were also identified at the community college level. The first type, academically related and supported primarily with state and local district funds, was the most common. The second type, occupationally oriented and supported with CETA and VEA funds, was identified in a few colleges only.

Academically Oriented. Separate, academically oriented programs had been established by most community colleges as a strategy to increase the reading, language, and math proficiency of academically disadvantaged students prior to matriculation or entry into the degree granting programs offered by the college. Thus, when students were identified as academically disadvantaged or limited-English proficient at the time of admission, they were placed in remedial or English as a Second Language classes either before entry, during an intensive summer program, or after entry, as part of the regular academic year. In general, these courses carried no credit and were mandatory; students had to complete the established sequence successfully or had to demonstrate proficiency prior to matriculation.

Occupationally Oriented. Several of the community colleges visited had established, either on campus or in satellite locations, separate skills centers offering CETA-eligible clients occupational training in a variety of areas. In most cases, the clients were referred to the college by other agencies, and the college operated as the CETA subcontractor in the delivery of the vocational training.

In a similar relationship with the Department of Rehabilitation, two colleges had established separate skills training centers for some physically and mentally handicapped students. Unlike the long-term care and sheltered employment services offered by most community-based programs for the handicapped, however, activities at the college centers focused more on the transitional skills and support type services needed by handicapped individuals to compete successfully in the labor force.

c. Unlike Many LEAs, Community Colleges Actively Sought to Establish Ties With External Agencies as a Strategy for Improving Occupational Services to All Students Including Special Needs Students.

Community colleges had established, in varying degrees, numerous linkages with other private and public institutions, including the Department of Rehabilitation, CETA, community-based organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, LEAs, and private employers in the community. These interorganizational arrangements were initiated often as a result of the participation of the presidents and occupational deans of the colleges in a number of community planning, employment, and training councils. In many cases, the arrangements had led to a variety of innovative programs for special needs populations using local industries and trade unions as resources for services to special needs college students. Conversely, often some community colleges, at the request of the Chamber of Commerce, developed special training programs to prepare workers for new industries moving in the area.

It appeared, therefore, that the community colleges were sensitive to the training and employment needs in their communities and had the resources and flexibility to modify programs and initiate quick action to respond to those needs.

Community-Based Organizations

Most community-based organizations that served the training and employment needs of special populations were, in general, of two types: (1) those supported directly by CETA to provide services to economically disadvantaged persons, many of whom were also academically disadvantaged, limited-English proficient, handicapped, or women, and (2) those supported, in part, by the Department of Rehabilitation and, in part, by private sources to provide rehabilitation, training, and employment services to handicapped persons.

With regard to the CETA-supported agencies, there was a high degree of consistency in the strategies used to serve the employment needs of their clients. In most cases, because of the high incidence of academic disadvantagement among their client populations, program administrators were forced to develop comprehensive programs for teaching remedial reading and math skills before providing employment or occupational training services. Often, a substantial portion of their available resources was devoted to these programs, and, as a result, administrators were concerned about their ability to show a high success rate for their training programs.

Private, nonprofit organizations such as the Association for Retarded Citizens and Goodwill Industries, among others, were the principal agencies providing training and employment services to handicapped adults. In general, these agencies provided a combination of survival skills training and some occupational training through client participation in sheltered workshops. Although often the purpose of the programs was to provide rehabilitative services to clients prior to competitive employment, in many cases more than 90 percent of the client population would remain in the sheltered workshops indefinitely. The lack of appropriate transitional services before and during the first few months of employment was a persistent point of criticism among advocates for handicapped populations. Another concern expressed by these advocates was the apparent exclusion of many learning disabled and mentally handicapped persons from training and employment services provided by community-based agencies; in many cases, it

(ESEA, Title I) or state categorical programs designed to serve the academic needs of the same students. Several reasons were identified for this apparent lack of coordination and multiple use of funding for the disadvantaged. First, federal and state compensatory programs were typically administered and coordinated by district-based administrators who rarely co-planned programs with vocational educators who, in most cases, controlled the use of the VEA funds. In the absence of local statutory policy direction, each group of administrators pursued its own interests without concern for coordination of funding.

Second, in general, federal and state compensatory programs entailed many burdensome and prohibitive regulations with regard to student eligibility requirements and programming of funds. On the other hand, vocational administrators enjoyed considerable flexibility in the administration and use of the VEA funds, even those targeted to special needs populations, and seemed unwilling to deal with problems of overly restrictive regulations. Moreover, many vocational educators expressed concern that compensatory programs were counterproductive for vocational education students, and, indeed, were harming vocational and career education programs by interfering with students' opportunities to enroll in vocational courses. Finally, in most cases, the VEA resources targeted to the disadvantaged were too small in comparison to the federal and state compensatory funds available to provide incentives for involvement of compensatory program administrators in vocational education.

In contrast to the issues and difficulties of coordinating various internal sources of funding for programs for the disadvantaged, the distribution and utilization pattern of VEA funds for the handicapped encouraged multiple uses of resources available for handicapped students within the school districts. Although vocational administrators were typically considered the grantees for all VEA funds, in most cases, those targeted to handicapped students were passed through to the central office special educators who, as the implementing group, planned and programmed for their use. The singular advantage of this arrangement was that this group of district administrators was also responsible for administering and programming the federal P.L. 94-142 funds as well as state special education funds for the handicapped. Thus, opportunties for coordinating multiple sources of funding in support of vocational programs for the handicapped were more evident than those for the disadvantaged. Nevertheless, in their attempt to program vocational education options for handicapped students, special educators faced different problems related to negative attitudes and priorities among school staff toward equitable educational opportunities for the handicapped. The greatest irony, therefore, was that, despite the availability of financial resources, sometimes the programs for the handicapped lacked the necessary support of high school personnel.

The strategy employed most often by special educators was to use the funds as a stimulus to encourage and motivate principals to establish in their schools separate special education vocational programs for handicapped students. In such cases, the VEA set-aside funds were typically used to purchase shop equipment and materials while federal, state, and local special education moneys were used to pay for salaries of teachers and support personnel. Finally, in some instances, VEA funds were used as seed money to establish innovative programs such as vocational evaluation centers in an effort to increase the representation of handicapped students in the regular vocational education and work experience programs. In one district, these efforts included multiple uses of inside and outside resources including Vocational Rehabilitation and CETA.

b. Community Colleges Tended to Use VEA Categorical Funds to Supplement Existing Programs and Support Services for Special Needs Populations or to Pilot-Test New Programs for Them.

The predominant community college strategy for allocating the VEA categorical funds for special needs populations was to support ongoing student services and instructional programs. That is, occupational deans, working collaboratively with directors of the colleges' student support service centers, agreed to contribute to the operation of the centers or instructional departments by paying for part-time staff or by purchasing appropriate materials to be used for special needs students enrolled in occupational programs. Because, often, these student service centers were funded partly with Higher Education federal and state grants and partly with local district funds, the VEA contribution represented attempts to coordinate existing resources in an effort to integrate the programs and to provide more complete and comprehensive counseling, remedial education, tutorial, and other support services to the college students who needed them.

In addition to coordination of VEA resources to support supplementary services, a few community colleges also used VEA categorical funds to support separate skills programs for special needs students or to initiate small pilot efforts to serve particular subpopulations of students. The separate efforts were usually related to programs supported either by CETA or by the Department of Rehabilitation. The colleges, in addition to the VEA support, often contributed in-kind services to the operation of the separate programs. Finally, some isolated efforts were identified, particularly in community colleges in Florida and California, where VEA funds had been used to pilot test and support new ideas or curriculum strategies to serve special needs populations. Provision of individualized, media-based remedial instructions related to occupational skills for academically disadvantaged students in Florida and attempts to develop a vocationally based English as a Second Language curriculum for LEP students in California were examples of such strategies. Often, the vocational deans reserved a small part of the VEA set-aside to encourage the college staff members to initiate pilot efforts in support of new services or programs for the special needs groups.

c. At the LEA and the Community College Levels, Confusion Existed Regarding the Meaning of Excess Costs and VEA Matching Requirements for Special Needs Populations.

The "excess cost" provisions appeared to create considerable confusion among vocational administrators and other key respondents in school districts and community colleges visited. Responses about excess costs varied from "I don't know" to explanations that were typically unrelated to the guidelines prepared by the federal Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. The typical interpretation focused on program administration costs rather than individual per pupil costs. That is, excess costs were usually defined as the additional funds required to cover the cost of occupational programs that were "operating in the red" or that cost more than the revenues they generated through students' enrollment and participation.

With regard to the needs for matching funds for special needs programs, it was clear that the VEA requirements had not created new local moneys for vocational services and programs at the local level. In some states such as Florida and Texas, apparently, the local matching requirements were met at the state level. Alternately, when educational jurisdictions were required to match the funds from the local tax base, they appeared to do so most often by applying part of agencies' tax-levy allocations earmarked for vocational/occupational programs and personnel.

d. To a Large Degree, LEA and Community College Use of External Nonfinancial Resources in Support of Programs for Special Needs Populations Was Limited.

Except for a few isolated cases, outside resources in terms of either information (e.g., model programs, curricular guides, instructional and in-service training materials) or technical assistance were seldom used by school districts or community colleges before or during implementation of special needs vocational projects. Although major efforts for collaboration with outside agencies existed and in some cases educational jurisdictions worked closely with their respective state agencies, the interactions were most often directed at issues affecting administration of the regular vocational/occupational programs, not the special needs vocational programs and services. In some cases, the arrangement led to improvement of vocational opportunities and services for all students and, therefore, some special needs students benefited as well.

vocational opportunities and services for all students and, therefore, some special needs students benefited as well.

e. Community-Based Organizations Rarely Participated in the Use of VEA Categorical Funds for Special Needs Populations.

For the most part, community-based organizations serving the training and employment needs of special populations operated independently of the education agencies in the communities. Their funding came from a combination of public and private sources, including CETA, the Department of Rehabilitation, philanthropies and, in some cases, particularly for agencies serving the handicapped, contracts with private employers and sales of novelty and decorative products through local or nationwide distribution centers.

Seldom did the community-based groups use VEA resources to provide services to their clients. There were, however, several instances in which adult basic education funds were used by community-based groups to supplement their programs. In general, the funds were not allocated directly to the agencies; rather, the educational jurisdiction responsible for the administration of adult programs in the community assigned teachers to the

CBOs for remedial reading, math, and survival skill instructions to the adult clients participating in their programs.

f. CETA-Supported Programs Devoted a Considerable Portion of Their Financial and Human Resources for Remedial Reading and Math Programs to Prepare Clients for Occupational Training.

According to Administrators of CETA-sponsored employment and training programs, the academic competence of their clients was so low that, in most cases, attention had to be devoted to the acquisition of minimum proficiencies in reading, language, and math skills prior to participation in the training and employment programs. As a result, most of the programs had devised strategies and had allocated program resources to provide remedial instructions to their clients either on-site or through referrals to the local community colleges. The similarity of the argument presented by school representatives with regard to services for academically disadvantaged students was particularly evident: limited basic skills training had to be provided prior to placement in existing regular vocational or job training programs. Researchers could not help but be struck by the existence of a "parallel" educational system that was being supported with CETA funds for economically disadvantaged persons for whom the public education system had been of little use.

5. Effects

Issues concerning effects or consequences of VEA-related vocational education programs or services for special needs populations conceived or measured in terms of traditional indicators presented a number of difficult problems. The study was not designed to gather data appropriate for quantitative analysis of ultimate outcomes as they related to vocational options and quality of instructions or opportunities for meaningful employment for special needs persons. Had the study proceeded from such a frame of reference, the task would have been difficult indeed, since rarely were there attempts in the communities to assess systematically the effects of the various strategies and programs for special populations.

The discussion of effects, therefore, is based on the conclusion drawn from the analysis of the perceptions and judgment of respondents directly involved with vocational programs for special populations, apart from "success" or "failure" of VEA projects for special needs populations as a whole. The major ones are noted below.

a. The Lack of Local Statutory Policy Direction for Vocational Education and the Districts' General Policies Toward Student Proficiency Requirements for Graduation Limited Vocational Education Opportunities for All Students and, in Particular, Those with Special Needs.

Many school district representatives expressed concerns that the "back to basics" movement and its related policy emphasis on proficiency requirements usually defined in terms of academic skills rather than work-related skills had a harming effect on career and vocational education opportunities for students, particularly for those with special needs. Additional academic course requirements as well as the need for remedial education for students who failed proficiency exams but wanted to graduate from high school precluded them from participating in vocational training. This was particularly the case when students were required to travel to skill centers for their vocational training and had to devote at least one-half day.

Because vocational education in the districts was not a priority concern for local policymakers, school administrators and guidance counselors were reluctant to program the "borderline" students for vocational courses if such placements would interfere with the additional academic and remedial courses necessary for graduation. The only students guided, more or less, automatically into vocational programs were the severely academically disadvantaged and the handicapped who were placed typically in separate vocational or world-of-work oriented programs. In general, these students were ill-equipped to pass the proficiency exams and were not eligible for regular high school diplomas.

b. Local Policies, Identification, Planning Procedures and Strategies for Vocational Education for Special Needs Students Were Reactive to Other Federal and State Mandates Concerning Educational Opportunities for Special Populations.

None of the districts visited had adopted specific policies or identification or planning procedures for services to special needs students that were prompted by the provisions of the national VEA. In most cases, the existing policies and procedures affecting the identification of special needs populations and the scope and nature of the instructional and support services provided to them were established as a result of other federal and state mandates, in particular, the provisions of P.L. 94-142 affecting services to the handicapped and ESEA Title I and state compensatory programs for the academically disadvantaged.

In many cases, however, particularly with regard to ESEA Title I for the disadvantaged, the criteria for program eligibility and student assessment of needs were more appropriate to academic course requirements than work-related proficiences. As a result, the typical strategies and programs designed to help students overcome handicaps that prevented them from succeeding in regular vocational education were rarely based on specific vocational or work-related needs assessments. Indeed, students needing ESEA Title I or state compensatory educational services were unlikely to be placed in regular vocational programs; if such students were participating and receiving special services, however, the "treatments" were usually based on assessment of conditions that resulted in academic failure rather than assessment of academic needs related to success in the specific vocational curriculum.

The local districts' priorities related to basic proficiency requirements in academic areas and the availability of sizable funds in most school districts for compensatory remedial education programs for academically disadvantaged students resulted in extensive program planning and administration activities for disadvantaged students at the LEA level. Unfortunately, vocational educators were, in general, excluded from this process; therefore, their role in the development of guidelines and procedures for district-wide programs for these students was limited. Thus, in most cases, planning and program activities for the VEA funds for the disadvantaged were carried out independently by each district's vocational education administrators and building principals. Based on these activities, the funds were either distributed among the various schools to be used at the discretion of the principals or allocated to the separate vocationally oriented programs for the purchase of shop equipment and materials to be used by academically disadvantaged students. As a result of these uncoordinated efforts, VEA-related projects for disadvantaged students tended to act in isolation from other school-based programs and, in general, had minimal effects on the target population.

c. The Effects of the VEA on Increasing Participation of Special Needs Populations in Regular Vocational Programs Were Minimal. Nevertheless, Separate Programs Supported by VEA Categorical Funds Increased Vocational Education Opportunities for Special Needs Populations, in Particular the Academically Disadvantaged and the Handicapped.

Two observations emerged sharply from the analysis of the interview data at the LEA level. One, the VEA appeared to have minimal effects on increasing the participation of special needs populations in regular vocational programs and, two, the effects of the VEA provisions with regard to vocational options for limited-English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, Indians, and women were negligible since VEA special needs program activities were rarely targeted to them.

The major recipients of VEA-supported special needs services and activities at the LEA level were the severely academically disadvantaged students and the handicapped, primarily the mentally retarded students, for whom special or separate vocationally oriented programs had been established and were supported with VEA dollars. In a few instances as well, LEAs used the funds to initiate and pilot-test unique programs such as Vocational Evaluation Centers (Jacksonville, Florida, and Modesto, California) and After-School and Shared Instruction programs (New York City) designed to increase the vocational opportunities of handicapped and academically disadvantaged students. Thus, to the extent that such options and opportunities had been extended for disadvantaged and handicapped students, as a result of VEA programs, the national expenditures had positive effects on these subgroups.

d. Modifications in the 1976 Education Amendments Concerning the Definition of Special Needs Populations Eligible for VEA Categorical Funds had not Resulted in Procedural or Programmatic Changes at the Local Educational Level.

Provisions in the Education Amendments of 1976 specified that federal VEA set-aside funds be spent on special needs populations, including those with academic, economic, mental and physical handicaps to pay up to 50 percent of the additional program costs incurred because of these students' special needs. In addition, the legislation required that a proportion of the set-aside funds for the disadvantaged be used for limited-English proficient students, the specific amount related proportionately to each state's LEP population aged 15 to 24.

Results of the analyses of the interview data with regard to the effects of the changes in the VEA on local procedures and strategies for special needs populations suggested that (1) those students who were now considered eligible to receive services included all or any of the students who might have been serviced by the definitions in the 1968 legislation, (2) local planning and program strategies for the special needs populations had not been affected by the changes in the 1976 legislation, and (3) the "excess cost" provision and matching requirements were not clearly understood or considered relevant. In general, however, it should be noted that few respondents at the LEA level were familiar with the complex provisions of the VEA, and most followed closely the guidelines established by the state agencies.

e. In Many Ways, Community Colleges Served as a Model in the Delivery of Occupational-Related Support Type Services to College Enrolled Special Needs Students.

In contrast to the separate, often uncoordinated efforts typical of many VEA special needs projects at the LEA level, community colleges presented a totally different picture. In most cases, coordinated planning and needs assessment activities led to integrated strategies to serve the needs of all special populations within the context of regular occupational and academic programs. Moreover, the support services and special activities were supported with multiple sources of funding, including federal, state, and local dollars. College administrators seemed much less concerned with the need to "keep the programs separate" and not to co-mingle categorical funds than were their LEA counterparts.

In part because of this apparent flexibility and in part because of the colleges' expressed concern to be responsive to the education and training needs of persons in their communities, key administrators seemed willing to take calculated risks and to seek outside expertise and collaborative relationships in an effort to establish programs and services for the special needs populations. Despite these efforts, however, problems existed; in some instances, college administrators noted that, because of the large size of the special needs populations, particularly the academically disadvantaged, their efforts often fell short and some students dropped out before completing training or were guided into less demanding occupations. This appeared to be particularly the case with regard to training for occupations in the allied health field, especially nursing. In fact, several community colleges had established special resource centers to assist academically disadvantaged students and thereby, to increase their representation in this area.

f. For the Most Part, Exchanges Between Community-Based Organizations and Education Agencies Were Rare Even Though the Community-Based Groups Conducted Extensive Remedial Education Programs in Addition to Employment and Skill Training Programs for Their Adult Client Populations.

As noted, community-based organizations that were either totally supported by CETA or party supported by Vocational Rehabilitation planned and conducted their programs for special needs clients independent of vocational programs in the local schools. In many cases, the CETA prime sponsor and the local Department of Rehabilitation seemed to play a positive supportive role, but the responsibilities for program design and implementation rested with the program directors and their staff.

All of the programs, it seemed, were hindered by lack of financial resources because of the fact that a considerable portion of their budgets had to be directed toward the provisions of remedial reading and math skills and in some cases, ESL instruction instead of occupational and employment training. In this regard, some prime sponsors were considering the alternative of consolidating academic training for all CETA-eligible clients in a community under the aegis of one subcontractor rather than having each agency develop and conduct its own programs.

APPENDIX

COORDINATED EFFORTS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES TO SPECIAL NEEDS GROUPS

A. INTRODUCTION

There is probably no single issue more important and at the same time more confusing than the convergence of efforts between education agencies and other public training and employment agencies (e.g., CETA and Vocational Rehabilitation) to provide comprehensive services to special needs populations. In many respects, the federal government in recent years has recognized the importance and potential value of collaborative efforts to provide service by specifying a number of legislative mandates for coordination among Vocational Education, CETA and Vocational Rehabilitation. Moreover, Congress, through its most recent legislations on the topic, particularly the 1978 CETA Amendments, has created a number of mechanisms and incentives to encourage and facilitate the establishment of interinstitutional arrangements involving federal, state, and local governments.

There are many ways in which the federal government is currently supporting coordination between CETA, Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation. Some of the activities differ according to the level of government while others vary with regard to administrative functions. As indicated, however, the emphasis on collaborative efforts among vocational education and employment service agencies has been recent. Thus, the effects on the participants at the various levels of government as well as on the nature of the services provided to special needs groups have yet to be evaluated systematically. To our knowledge, there have been few, if any, in-depth studies of collaborative efforts between CETA and vocational education programs.

This special needs study, involving a modified field ethnographic approach, was primarily concerned with gathering information related to how and to what extent the educational and occupational needs of special groups identified in the VEA and related federal legislation are being met by various public and private agencies in different communities. To gain a detailed picture about objectives, strategies, and resources deployed, researchers sought information on local arrangements among private or public community agencies and educational agencies designed to serve the special needs groups.

In this chapter, we present the results of our findings regarding coordination efforts in various local communities. The results are based primarily on focused discussions with a variety of respondents involved with vocational education and other training and employment-related programs. In a few cases, document collection was possible, but, more often than not, review was limited to formal agreements drawn between and among the agencies. Few reports or detailed recordings of meetings and other exchanges existed. In all cases, however, researchers attempted as much as possible to reduce the subjectivity of the verbal information by delineating and cross- validating the various points of view.

Our approach is descriptive; of the number of collaborative arrangements identified, seven, representing a variety of interconnections and exchanges among different agencies in the five states visited, have been selected as "exemplary" and are presented below. The seven cases were selected because they represented unique examples of coordination in terms of both the types of institutions involved and the nature of the exchanges and the services that were provided. The seven cases are: the Vocational Evaluation Center in Modesto, California; the Coordinated Planning Project in Imperial County, California; the Special Needs Projects at the Indian River Community College in Fort Pierce, Florida; the "Common Market" strategy for providing services at the John Wood Community College in Quincy, Illinois; the Career Inter Program (CIP), a model project, in Poughkeepsie, New York; the Urban Skills Institute in Chicago, Illinois; and the Industry/Education Council in Dutchess County, New York. None of these cases was identified _a priori_; rather the selection was made after our visits to the fifteen sites as a result of our interest in identifying the variety of strategies used by local communities to provide vocational education and training to special needs populations. Of particular interest, of course, were the collaborative efforts among local institutions and participants to provide such services.

In considering each case, the primary criterion was evidence of interorganizational exchanges among the participants. Thus, we eliminated from our sample all projects that did not entail the interconnection of institutions, public or private. Second, the seven cases selected for detailed review, in addition to exhibiting some basic structural similarities, also represent some striking contrasts on certain dimensions. For instance, the Modesto arrangement involved the efforts of the public schools and two other public agencies to provide services to handicapped individuals; the CIP in Poughkeepsie was an example of an arrangement between the public schools and a nonprofit community-based group to serve the needs of the academically disadvantaged and involved the replication of a federally-supported demonstration project; the Dutchess County activity represented the very dynamic leadership of a small number of enthusiasts to provide service to economically disadvantaged persons and at the same time to meet the manpower needs of the county; finally, the community college arrangements in Fort Pierce, Florida, Quincy and Chicago, Illinois represented the efforts of secondary institutions to reach out to their communities and attempt to meet the educational and vocational needs of special groups.

For each arrangement, the information is organized as follows. First, a description of the collaborative effort is presented, including the role of each constituent agency, the objectives, and activities of the arrangement. Second, the environmental context and factors leading to the arrangement are described. Finally, the problems faced by the participants in the network as well as the outcomes related to the effort are presented.

B. COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

1. Modesto City School District - Vocational Evaluation Center for the Handicapped.

a. Description of Arrangement.

The Modesto City Schools, the Stanislaus County CETA Youth Employment and Training Program, and the California Department of Rehabilitation had entered into agreement to establish and maintain a career vocational evaluation center, a mobile testing facility, designed to assess handicapped pupils' employability skills. The major goal of this collaborative effort was to develop a vehicle through which referring agencies, including public schools, could plan vocational training and employment programs for handicapped youth on the basis of objective assessments related to the occupational interests and competencies of each individual.

Each of the three cooperating agencies contributed to the operation of the vocational evaluation center (VEC), although the Modesto Public Schools, in consultation with the other two agencies and an Advisory Council, was responsible for management of the unit. The Advisory Council for the VEC consisted of representatives from the cooperating agencies-- i.e., the schools, the county CETA youth programs, and the Department of Rehabilitation--as well as members in the community interested in the program.

The interagency agreement specified the shared role and responsibility of each agency with regard to program planning, management, and administration as well as budgeting and fiscal commitments to the development and maintenance of the center. In addition to the education, training, and employment services each agency was mandated to provide to its clients, the cooperating agencies contributed to the center as follows. The Modesto Public Schools, using VEA Subpart 2 set-aside funds for the handicapped, purchased equipment and supplies for the operation and maintenance of the center's activities. The County CETA Youth Employment and Training Program paid for the vocational evaluation staff at the center, including the evaluator and an assistant. The Department of Rehabilitation provided initial funding for the rehabilitation of a school-owned trailer as a testing facility and for the installation of a wheelchair lift to accommodate physically handicapped individuals. In addition, because the center charged clients a fee for services provided, the latter two agencies as well as other referring agencies had agreed to reimburse the center for the cost of the individual vocational evaluations.

One of the unique features of the center was its mobility. The center was established in a large, self-contained mobile trailer that was in use throughout the calendar year. The ability to move this testing facility between the four high schools in the city, as well as between shopping centers and government centers throughout the county, allowed greater services at lower cost. The eligible population served at the center included (1) handicapped students in attendance at the public schools, (2) any CETA-eligible persons referred by the prime sponsor or the subcontractors, (3) referrals made by personnel of the Deparment of Rehabilitation, and (4) self-referrals or individuals referred by other agencies, including business or industry. Primary emphasis was directed to persons between the ages of 14 and 23, although all age groups were served.

A variety of standardized vocational evaluation testing and assessment instruments was available at the center. In general, the primary emphasis was on tests of manual dexterity and basic thought processes (e.g., performance testing and language/math achievement). Each client was evaluated in selected areas based on the individual's interests and the specifications of the referring agency. A structured report was prepared by the VEC staff summarizing test results, recommending the level of work most appropriate for the client, and specifying the instruction, work experience, and other support services needed to help the individual achieve his or her employment objective. The report was then forwarded to the referring agency. In the case of high school students, the information was sent to the special education resource teachers and school psychologists for use in the parent conferences and was included with each handicapped student's IEP. According to respondents at the school district, often the information was used to determine placement in vocational education or in the Regional Occupational Programs. Moreover, the information was also available to work experience coordinators who were responsible for the student's eventual job placement.

b. Environmental Context.

Stanislaus County in the San Joaquin Valley in California is an area characterized by persistent and high levels of unemployment. According to respondents, the unemployment rate in 1978 was approximately 15 percent although the estimates for those aged 16 to 21 were double that of the general population. Thus, as was often the case in other regions visited, the employment opportunities for handicapped workers were practically nonexistent.

A major factor leading to the cooperative relationship and, thus, to the establishment of the vocational evaluation center, was the realization that handicapped youth needed to be better prepared to compete in the existing labor market. The availability of VEA funds for the handicapped and the passage of the State Master Plan for Special Education, making the school districts responsible for the identification, assessment, and planning of appropriate instructional programs to meet the exceptional needs of handicapped students, were also contributing factors.

In the Modesto community, there appeared to be a long history of collaborative efforts among public agencies in support of services and programs for community residents. Moreover, the Modesto Board of Education seemed to have always encouraged the active involvement of the public schools in a variety of cooperative efforts. Currently, in addition to the vocational evaluation center, the public schools participated in separate cooperative programs with a number of public and private agencies including:

- the county CETA prime sponsor (YETP funds) to sponsor Youth Employment and Training Programs including summer youth programs serving all independent school districts in Stanislaus County.
- the County CETA prime sponsor to coordinate a CETA/Vocational Education/Private Enterprise Linkages Youth Demonstration Program. This was a recently funded project designed to (1) identify and bring together the various education, training, and employment agencies in the county, (2) examine the services they provided to clients, and (3) develop guidelines for future cooperative planning and program administration based on the needs of special populations and employers in the county.
- the California Employment Development Department to administer a cooperative career education project for economically disadvantaged youth, in particular, children of migrant families.
- the California State Department of Education, to administer a personal development program under the Career Education Incentive Act, P.L. 95-207, for pregnant minors and teenage parents.
- the California Department of Rehabilitation to use the services of rehabilitation counselors assigned to work with handicapped students in the schools. The arrangement had evolved as a result of a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies.
- the Community College District and the Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Stanislaus County to provide part-time employment (teacher aides) and supervision to college students in work study programs and also to senior citizens of low-income status.
- the Central Valley Opportunity Center to provide counseling and skills training to clients, particularly seasonal farmworker youth recruited, identified, and referred by this agency.
- Head Rest, a community-based nonprofit organization that assigned "crisis" counselors to work in Modesto City Schools.

> Unfortunately, this arrangement was recently terminated when the district was unable to meet its 20 percent matching funds commitment as a result of Proposition 13.

The variety of prior successful cooperative initiatives involving the schools and the resulting interpersonal and professional relationship among the leaders in the various organizations help to explain, in part, the success of the cooperative efforts leading to the establishment of the vocational evaluation center. The idea for the center originated at the public school level when the Director of Vocational Education and the Supervisor of Work Experience Education were planning for the use of the VEA set-aside funds for handicapped students. Subsequently, these individuals pursued discussions with representatives from CETA and the Department of Rehabilitation that led to the collaborative arrangement and to the sharing of resources including money, information and technical assistance to develop the Center.

It is noteworthy that special education staff in the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools who served handicapped students in the Modesto Public schools were not directly involved in the planning for this project. Indeed, none of the special education state or Federal, P.L. 94-142 funds received by the Stanislaus County Board of Education and channeled to the Modesto School district seemed to be used in support of the Center's activities. In many respects, it appeared that, at least for Modesto, coordination and joint efforts were easier between vocational educators and representatives of outside organizations than among vocational and special educators within the local and county public schools. This pattern of collaboration was in sharp contrast, however, to that observed in Duval County, Florida, the only other LEA providing vocational evaluation services to students. In Florida, the center was used exclusively for public school students, was supported with P.L. 94-142 funds as well as VEA set-aside funds, and was managed by the LEA special education staff. Thus, although there were no attempts made to encourage or involve outside participation in the Center's activites, special educators and vocational educators worked together in an effort to coordinate resources.

c. Outcomes/Problems Related to Collaborative Efforts.

Based on conversations with representatives of the three cooperating agencies, the collaborative effort was considered a success and each agency planned to continue its support of the evaluation center's activities. Moreover, each was willing to participate in additional inter-agency agreements and to develop other program ties that would allow the schools to maximize use of available community resources for helping handicapped students become employable. In the past year, the Center conducted about 150 evaluations of which approximately one half was for clients referred by CETA and the Department of Rehabilitation. This ratio appeared satisfactory to each of the participating agencies. More importantly, however, the referring agencies seemed to value the assessment information obtained from the evaluation center and, as noted by respondents, utilized it in the development of individual training and employment plans for their clients.

The outcomes with respect to vocational evaluations for the high school handicapped students were mixed, however. Vocational educators and work experience personnel in the shools felt that the center served an important function and provided relevant information in support of decisions regarding placement of handicapped students in the vocational and work experience programs. Special educators, on the other hand, felt that, on the basis of their classroom contact with the students, they could provide the same information without the need for putting the handicapped students in anxiety-producing testing situations. In fact, some suggested that, often, the results of the tests were invalid since the students could usually perform better in a less tense environment. Concerns were evident as well that the reults of vocational testing might be used as a justification by school administrators to exclude handicapped students from some of the regular vocational education programs.

In summary, although the Advisory Committee existed as a vehicle for resolving inter-agency disputes, issues or problems, no formal structure was established to exchange information and deal with intra-organizational conflicts. Many of the differences apparent between the vocational and special education staff could be resolved if the two groups collaborated more in the planning and management of the Center's activities. Fortunately, it appeared that both groups of educators recognized the problem and seemed determined to work toward a solution.

2. Imperial County Coordinated Planning Project--Imperial County, California.

a. Description of Arrangement.

Imperial County was one of three counties in California awarded a multi-year CETA grant to develop and pilot test a "transportable model" for coordinated planning among education and employment training agencies in the county. The project was designed to establish an inter-agency network to promote communication and to facilitate collaborative efforts among member agencies in three specific areas: (1) planning; (2) utilization of resources and (3) administration of vocational training and employment programs that provided both direct and supportive services to special needs clients.

The coordinated strategies were expected to lead to measurable improvement in the quality of services provided to eligible clients in the county at a lower cost since unnecessary duplication of efforts could be identified and eliminated systematically. The project was a three-year effort, renewable each year, after evaluation of progress was made.

Membership participation in the project was broad and included representatives from the CETA prime sponsor, the Employment Development Department, the Department of Rehabilitation, the County Department of Public Welfare, the Community College District (the Dean of Occupational Education at the Imperial Valley College), the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools as well as a representative from one of the public LEAs in the county (the Director of Vocational Education in the Holtville Public Schools). Some of the member agencies offered direct employment training services to clients while others provided supportive and/or instructional services such as job orientation, job development, GED preparation and ESL instruction.

Other than in-kind services, none of the participating agencies was required to contribute funds for the establishment of the network and implementation of its activities. The project was funded competitively in response to an RFP under CETA, Title II set-aside funds for discretionary use by governors.

At the time of our visit, the project had been in operation for approximately one year and respondents were anticipating that the Council's activities would be renewed for the subsequent year. The Coordinating Council's staff, housed at the County CETA offices, included three full-time persons--a project director, a researcher and a clerk/typist. No outside consultants had been hired as network facilitators, although the State CETA office (the funding agency) had contracted with the American Institutes for Research to conduct an independent formative evaluation of the project and to document the Council's activities. Clearly, the evaluators were viewed by respondents as advisors, providing intermittent written and verbal feedback with suggestions for change and improvement of procedures.

As noted, the project was not intended to provide specific services to clients. Rather, the initial goal was to identify and to develop the inter-organizational structures that would promote communication among member agencies; that is, facilitate the exchange of knowledge, information and resources leading to cooperative planning and administration of programs. The strategy for achieving this goal seemed to be through persuasion, education and reeducation of the membership.

The first year's activities then, were limited to a series of meetings in an effort to (1) identify each member agency's goals, legislative authority, organizational structure as well as expertise and capabilities to serve the various special needs populations in the county, and (2) achieve consensus on rules and procedures that would guide the work of the coordinating Planning Council. Respondents noted a number of initial difficulties encountered by the Council that needed to be overcome including:

- Lack of specific ideas among representatives concerning strategies to achieve collaboration.
- Concerns about the role each member was expected to play in the process. This was related to fear that any shared efforts would lead to loss of personal control.
- Lack of consensus with regard to priorities of needs.
- Inability to focus on target efforts to specific initiatives, since each representative guarded his or her particular interests.

- Lack of specific knowledge among members about the organizational, administrative and programmatic structure of each participating agency.
- Unwillingness to commit time or other organizational resources given the uncertainty of incentives; that is, how the outcome would lead to mutual benefits for the various representatives.

Not all of these problems were overcome, partly because they impinged on issues of turf and partly because no apparent forceful leader emerged from the process. When respondents were asked separately who the leader was, none was singled out. Nevertheless, the initial effort resulted in a comprehensive guidebook identifying the existing education and employment training agencies in the community and detailing the nature of the services they provided to their clients.

While the first year's efforts were directed to process issues, the objectives for the second and third year were to focus on the substance of the exchanges or transactions among member agencies. More specifically, the council was working toward the development of a centralized statistical data base to serve the planning needs of all member agencies and to facilitate the development of their individual annual plans. Members of the council were considering as well the feasibility of using common standardized intake forms to determine client eligibility. The expectation was that the standardized nature of the intake interview form would facilitate inter-agency transfers and referrals of special needs clients.

b. Environmental Context.

Imperial County in Southern California is a rural agri-business area with a total population of 89,500. The area covers approxmiately 4,284 square miles and includes 12 incorporated communities. The County is isolated geographically by mountain ranges and a desert that separates it from San Diego to the west, Riverside County to the north, Arizona to the east and Mexico to the south. Over 60 percent of the population was Hispanic, primarily Mexican Americans, 34 percent White and approximately six percent Black and other minorities. According to State Employment Development Department statistics, 70 percent of the population existed at or below the poverty level. Additionally, county unemployment ranked among the highest in California and the nation; approximately 25 percent after adjustments for seasonal variations were made.

Although the county was relatively small, a number of public service agencies existed in the community. In fact, public sector jobs and those supported with public funds contributed to a significant proportion of the total employment available in the county. The major private sector alternative was agriculture and its related businesses.

How to improve the employment opportunities for special needs populations, given the economic conditions in the county, was the principal issue dividing some members of the Council. Essentially, one group saw the potential of the Council as an opportunity for mobilizing efforts toward a major campaign to attract new businesses in the county. Their argument was based on the premise that the only way to help the special needs populations was to increase the total pool of private sector jobs available in the county. The counter argument made by the second group focused on the needs for the public agencies to coordinate their efforts and to provide more effective education and training to the special needs populations so that they could compete successfully for the positions available. Despite the fact that the directors of the various public agencies knew each other by first names and some had, in the past, collaborated on a number of specific agency projects, or were members of the same agency councils, the philosophical issues underlying their differences had not surfaced until they became involved in the Council activities.

Several factors contributed to the establishment of the County Coordinating Planning Council. First, as indicated, the community was relatively small and many of the agency leaders had formed longstanding personal and professional relationships. Second, there was a long history of cooperative agreements between many of the council member agencies. Moreover, since each agency had its advisory council, a number of the participants were involved in informal cross-organizational linkages as a result of reciprocal participation on these councils. Finally, the availability of the grant was considered a major incentive as well. Clearly, however, unless external resources could be secured, the project would not have been initiated. The individual most responsible for calling attention to the availability of the funds, for generating initial interest and for enlisting the help of others in writing the proposal was the director of vocational education in the Holtville Public schools. Presently, he was serving as the Chairman of the Council but did not necessarily view himself as its leader.

c. Outcomes and Problems Related to Collaborative Effort.

Clearly, the accomplishments achieved after one year of funding could be considered modest. Moreover, respondents generally agreed that the project was not yet at a point where agencies were willing to share resources. In fact, one of the major activities planned for the second year, the development of an on-line information data base, although valuable, could not be categorized as coordinated planning since its primary objective was to facilitate the preparation of the annual plans each agency did independently.

Nevertheless, most respondents were very optimistic that the efforts of the first year and the process established to open up the lines of communications among service agencies could lead to significant improvement in the way training and employment services were provided to special needs clients in the county. According to respondents the benefits will be derived from the increased opportunities to share resources among the various agencies representing diverse experiences, philosophies as well as sources of expert knowledge.

A more realistic picture was provided by one respondent, however, who suggested that the extent of coordinated planning was likely to depend on the incentives available or perceived by each of the participating members. The fact that none of the respondents had committed any agency funds to the project thus far and, furthermore, none had considered the eventual status of the arrangement once the CETA grant funds terminated, supported this view. Finally, many of the already identified problems and conflicts that tended to limit cooperation and coordination efforts had not been resolved. Rather, the council, in an attempt to proceed with its task, had set aside the conflicting issues and focused its attention instead on specific activities for which consensus could be achieved among agency representatives. Thus, in effect, a process for resolving conflict and determining priorities had not been established.

3. Indian River Community College, Fort Pierce, Florida.

a. Description of Arrangement.

Indian River Community College (IRCC), like all community colleges visited, supported a number of academic, vocational, technical, cultural and community service programs. This was done in keeping with the changed roles of the community colleges and their philosophies to serve the needs of all residents in their districts. Indian River Community College was unique, however, because it acted as the primary agency in Fort Pierce, Florida, responsible for the administration of most educational, training and employment programs targeted to all special needs populations.

Two factors helped to explain the college's increased involvement in the administration of these programs--(1) the perception among community leaders and residents that IRCC was the principal agency with the organizational capabilities and skills to administer efficiently special needs training and employment programs and (2) the support and willingness of the Board of Trustees to assume these responsibilities and the ability of IRCC administrators and staff to plan and to establish innovative programs to serve the special needs populations.

Following are some observations on the various special needs programs administered and coordinated by IRCC.

(1) IRCC Comprehensive CETA Programs for St. Lucie County.

Based on our observations in the five states and fifteen communities visited, Indian River Community College was to be the only post-secondary educational agency operating a comprehensive CETA program providing employment and training services to all CETA eligible clients in the community. In the past, the Balance-of-State Prime Sponsor had subcontracted with a number of community agencies (e.g., the State Employment Service, the Council on Aging, the Farmworkers Council, and the public LEAs) for the administration of its various CETA Title programs. Recently, however, in an attempt to standardize procedures and to improve the quality of training offered, the prime sponsor had opted to contract the work to a single agency. Thus, in response to a request for proposals, IRCC was awarded the contract and was designated as the comprehensive CETA operator serving economically disadvantaged residents in St. Lucie County.

The decision made by the IRCC Board of Trustees and the president to compete for the CETA contract and to administer all related training and employment programs through the college was viewed by respondents as an example of the Board's commitment to serve the increasing needs of special populations, particularly the disadvantaged. The program had the full support of the Board and the key policymakers and, although administered separately, the supervisor was directly responsible to the Associate Dean of Instruction. As will be described below, in many respects the CETA program had become an integral part of the college and shared many of the facilities, services and activities provided by the community college district to all its students.

Definition/Identification of Target Population. Potential CETA clients were referred to IRCC through a variety of sources including the State Employment Office, other social service agencies, announcements in the local media, the college placement and financial aid office and the public LEAs. To determine eligibility, all potential clients were interviewed and assisted by counselors in completing the necessary applications. Although criteria varied depending on the specific CETA Title programs, the common criterion was economic disadvantagement as defined by the Federal CETA legislation.

Once clients were certified as eligible, they participated in a structured orientation and assessment program to determine their strengths and interests and to develop individualized employability plans with timetables based on observed needs. All participants of the CETA programs registered as regular students at IRCC and had access to all programs and services available to all students.

With regard to the CETA Title IV In-School Youth and Summer Programs, certification of eligible students was conducted by the high school guidance counselors in the three public LEAs in St. Lucie County. Periodic workshops were held at the college for the high school counselors to explain procedures and to discuss opportunities available to disadvantaged students.

Planning. The CETA program at IRCC has its own Advisory Council made up of nine members, three from each of the three incorporated municipalities in St. Lucie County. For each city, the three member representation included a person from a community-based organization, a local business, and a lay person from the community. The Council met twice during the year to review the plans and programs considered by the CETA program director and his staff.

In addition to the planning conducted independently by the CETA staff and then reviewed by the Advisory Council, the CETA program director, as a faculty member, attended a variety of community college council meetings, including some chaired by the Deans of Occupational education, guidance and support services. Thus, although not a member of IRCC councils such as the General Vocational Education Coordinating Council, the CETA director had considerable input into the planning activities affecting special needs populations through his personal and professional relationships with colleagues at the college. As put by the director of CETA, "I have the luxury of a double planning system...the college administration seeks the input from these organizations (State Employment Office, Chamber of Commerce, Private Industry Council) and modifies its programs to meet their needs. Since CETA is part of the college and our clients are enrolled in the college programs, we are assured that we are on the right track...."

Strategies. As indicated, on the basis of academic achievement and vocational interest tests, an employability plan was developed for each CETA eligible applicant detailing the specific training program needed to achieve the employment goals. The programs included: Classroom Training, Training and Work Experience, On-the-Job training, Adult Work Experience, a Migrant Seasonal Farmworkers Program, a Public Service Employment Program and the Youth Programs including a career Exploration Experience Program and a Summer Youth Employment Program. Briefly, each of these programs is described below.

In the Classroom Training Program, participants could enroll in a full range of occupational offerings provided by the college and leading to a degree or certification. In effect, the students were "mainstreamed" in the regular occupational programs and were expected to meet the requirements of the programs for continuation. This was a full-time program with instruction for at least 30 hours per week while the clients received a stipend for participation. To assist the clients to succeed, they were programmed for individualized study related to their training at the Individualized Manpower Training System (IMTS) Centers. In addition, the CETA counselors provided guidance and support. The IMTS Centers were also used for remediation of academic deficiencies and GED preparation for trainees who needed such services prior to placement in the occupational programs.

The Training and Work Experience Program combined classroom training and work experience activities for CETA participants. The job placement counselors, as much as possible, attempted to place the individuals in public service agency positions related to the nature of the classroom training.

In the On-the-Job-training (OJT) program, the CETA clients were placed in private sector jobs and received OJT in occupational areas where training was not available at the college. For each client placed in an OJT position, a written contract was drawn between the college and the employer specifying the training objectives, the nature of the supervision and the duration of the agreement. Moreover, an agreement existed, although unwritten, that if the relationship was satisfactory, the employer would hire the trainee at the end of the training period. This was often contingent on the economic situation for the employer at the time OJT ended.

The Adult Work Experience Program was specifically targeted toward persons who had never been employed before. In most cases, participants were women, including displaced homemakers who were also heads-of-households. Many of the support-type activities including peer counseling and mini-courses emphasizing employability skills were coordinated with the Women's Education and Employment Training Program supported by IRCC.

The Public Service Employment Program provided jobs for approximately 200 CETA eligible clients in St. Lucie County. According to the CETA director, the participants were placed in agencies that could demonstrate the capabilities of providing adequate supervision to clients. The program had two phases including: (1) approximately 120 hours of classrooom related experience focusing on employability skills and exploration of career options, and (2) individualized educational experiences for clients, including IMTS participation and classroom training if necessary, to achieve their career goals.

The Title III CETA migrant program, funded through the Florida State Department of Education and administered by IRCC, provided classroom training, work experiences and OJT to seasonal migrant farm workers. Approximately 50 clients participated in the program.

The CETA, Title IV Youth Programs included two components, the Career Employment Experience program and the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). Both components provided employment and classroom training experiences to youth age 16-21. The major purpose was to encourage the high school students to continue their studies while introduing them to the world of work through part-time paid work experiences in a variety of settings including schools, recreation centers and hospitals. At the high schools, the programs were related, as much as possible, to the vocational experience programs administered by the LEAs. Career and employment counseling was provided to the eligible students by CETA counselors at IRCC. The SYEP program was administered on the same basis, except that students worked full-time during the summers and were required to attend weekly seminars focusing on employability skills.

In addition to the structured education and employment programs described above, CETA clients, as students of the college, were eligible for a variety of other student support services, including counseling, job placement, transportation and child care services while attending classes. The latter two, transportation and child care services, although available free to all students enrolled at the college, were subsidized by CETA for its clients.

Resources. Most of the financial support for the CETA programs at IRCC came from the Balance-of-State prime sponsor via the competitive grant. However, external funds, primarily from the college, were used to strengthen the programs and were essential to their success. Included among the community college district resources used by CETA were the following:

- Use of office space and college equipment and facilities for the administration of the programs. The college did not charge overhead costs to the CETA program for the use of space, utilities and college facilities. Moreover, since CETA staff members were considered IRCC employees, all personnel tasks related to payroll, vacation, insurance and so forth were handled by the college finance office at no charge to CETA.

- Availability of IRCC student support services system for CETA participants. CETA clients benefited from services provided by guidance, health and placement counselors at the college without incurring costs charged to the CETA programs. In addition, most CETA participants spent considerable time at the two IMTS Centers for remedial and basic skills instruction. The IMTS Centers were part of the college support system available to all students needing supplementary instructions in English language and math skills. Of course, the college also benefited from CETA client participation in the IMTS Centers as well as in the regular classes since the State reimbursed the IRCC on the basis of attendance as determined by Full-Time Equivalencies.

- Use of IRCC transportation system and day care services by CETA clients. Since there was no public transportation in St. Lucie County or the surrounding counties, the college, using district operating funds, provided bus transportation to its students from various locations in the area on a regularly scheduled daily basis. CETA participants and their dependent children could use the bus system to attend activities at the college. Moreover, during training, the CETA participants could leave their children for day care services at the IRCC day care center operated by the college as part of its Child Development program. The college, however, charged the CETA program a minimum fee for each program participant using child care services.

Effects. Administration of the CETA programs under the aegis of the community college appeared to have consolidated procedures and resulted in greater and more effective coordination of services for economically disadvantaged persons. Three factors seemed to have contributed to these beneficial effects: First, the full support of the college for the programs established under CETA, leading to greater utilization of all the college resources to supplement those available through the prime sponsor; second, and perhaps most important, the philosophical compatibility between college personnel and CETA staff with regard to service needed for special needs population (in fact, the groups operated as one faculty supporting each other and sharing information, ideas and resources to serve the economically disadvantaged); and finally, the CETA programs benefited from the perceptions of employers and other community representatives who considered the community college as a responsive and effective agency serving the needs of the community. In many respects, the feelings of support for the college's efforts were transferred to the CETA activities since now, they were part of the college's programs.

(2) IRCC Skills Development Center.

In addition to administering the comprehensive CETA programs serving the needs of economically disadvantaged persons in St. Lucie County, IRCC was one of two community colleges visited offering a separate occupational program designed to assist handicapped persons prepare for vocational careers. The program, initiated in September 1977, was the result of a cooperative effort between the college, the State Department of Rehabilitation, and the Office of Vocational Education. The program was unique not only because of its location in a community college campus and its multiple sources of support, but also because of its philosophy that stressed the "mainstreaming" of handicapped students into regular college programs while at the same time addressing individual needs through a variety of special programs.

The purpose of the Skills Development Center was to provide work adjustment and extended employment services to handicapped individuals in order to facilitate their movement into competititve employment and thus, to maximize their earning potential. The existence of the Center and the development of its goals and programs were the result of a formal needs assessment conducted by the college. The assessment identified as a primary need transitional or adjustment services for handicapped persons in order to facilitate their entry in the labor force.

With the full support of the Board of Trustees, the president and the Dean of Occupational Technical education, a proposal to establish a Skills Center at IRCC was submitted to the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS). HRS favored the proposal because the college had a history of commitment and responsiveness to community needs and because supplementary services available to handicapped persons on campus would not be found typically in other more traditional rehabilitative settings.

Identification and Selection of Clients. Approximately 160 handicapped persons in the four county area (Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee and St. Lucie Counties) were served each year by the Center. Most were either emotionally or physically handicapped persons whose disabilities prevented them from participating in competitive employment and who needed transitional and sheltered employment.

Specific admission criteria included age (16 or above), I.Q. (70 or above), and evidence of employability (e.g., medically and psychologically stable; that is, not dangerous to self or to others; basic mobility including ability to access college transportation if needed; control of bodily functions). In most cases, the clients were referred to the center by HRS after having undergone thorough medical and psychological screening. Handicapped persons who did not qualify for the training programs at the Skills Center were often referred to the Tri-County Rehabilitative Center for extended, often permanent sheltered employment. Those who were referred to the IRCC skills Development Center, however, registered as college students and had access to all the student support services and other privileges available to all students.

Planning. The Skill Development Program at IRCC was guided by its own Advisory Committee which met twice a year to review progress made and to approve plans for the subsequent year. The Committee included representatives from the college, HRS as well as other interested individuals from public agencies and local businesses. The major responsibilities for program planning and development, however, rested with the program director and his staff.

Although none of the staff was a member of the college Occupational Advisory Committee, some participated on other committees including the Affirmative Action Committee, the Safety Committee and the Architectural Accessibility Study group. Moreover, since the director of the Skills Development Center was responsible directly to the Dean of Instruction and since he had faculty status, he attended many of the meetings chaired by the Dean of Occupational Education, particularly those involving the planning of programs for special needs populations and the use of VEA funds. Thus, although the program was administered separately, there were considerable informal cross departmental linkages and information exchanges. The flow of information was facilitated by the proximity of the program due to its location on campus and the fact that the program staff were considered part of the college faculty and had all the privileges and responsibilities associated with such status.

Strategies. Within the limit of the scope of services available, the program stressed individualized attention to meet the specific needs of its handicapped clients. To this end, one of the major activities provided by the Center was comprehensive vocational evaluation. In all cases, the placement into the various programs available through the Center or at the college was based on evaluation findings as well as interests and abilities of the students.

The students' vocational strengths and interests were identified through a variety of techniques including work sample and situational assessments, psychometric testing to determine job readiness and work tolerance levels, and counseling. Based on the evaluation findings, vocational goals and a plan to achieve those goals were established for each student. Depending on the individual, the plan might call for a program in which the student was supportively integrated into the college's regular occupational classes and activities or, alternatively, a program totally supported by the Skills Center. The programs provided through the Skills Center included: Personal Adjustment Training, Vocational/Work Adjustment Training, Vocational Skill Training, Employability Training and Job Placement. An extended employment sheltered program was also provided for a small number of clients (approximately eight) who were unable to participate in competitive employment. A brief description of each program follows.

The Personal Adjustment Training program stressed independent living skills taught in small groups by the Center staff. Some of the skills taught included basic survival English and math, communication skills, personal hygiene and grooming, personal budgeting, telling time and so forth. The students made extensive use of the college's IMTS Centers, where a specific area had been designated for handicapped students.

The Vocational Adjustment program provided the opportunity for handicapped students to learn employability skills and appropriate work behaviors necessary to cope and succeed in the world of work. Techniques included counseling, assertiveness training, behavior modification and family counseling. The skills were taught while the students were involved in on-the-job training activities in a sheltered workshop environment at the

Center. The job assignments varied in complexity and students could move gradually from the least to most complex jobs as they demonstrated specific competencies. Remunerations to students reflected the nature of the specific task assignments. If indicated, the students could also participate in many of the activities related to personal adjustment including individualized remedial academic training and GED preparation at the IMTS Centers.

The Vocational Skill program was administered through the regular occupational programs at IRCC. Based on their interests and abilities, students could enroll in more than 42 different vocational-technical training programs. In addition to the college programs, on-the-job training could be arranged in other areas with community employers through cooperation with HRS. For students in the Vocational Skills program, the Center staff worked with the college instructor to individualize the curriculum and tailor it to the students' capabilities and needs. Support services to these students included counseling at the Center as well as individualized instructions in remedial English language and math skills related to specific occupational needs at the IMTS Centers.

Upon completion of vocational skill training or when students in the other programs were identified as job ready, they participated in employability training classes conducted on campus. The curriculum focused on handling job interviews and problem questions, developing a job resume, locating employment opportunities, completing applications and preparing for the first weeks on the job. A full-time job placement counselor was available at the Center to identify potential positions and to facilitate the process. In addition, job placement was coordinated through the college placement office and also HRS as well as the Florida State employment service.

For a few students who had difficulty acquiring the necessary skills to participate in competitive employment, the Center provided extended employment opportunities in its sheltered workshops. These opportunities were limited however, since the Center focused more on providing transitional services rather than long-term care. As indicated, a county rehabilitative center was available in the community to serve the long-term needs of this population of handicapped persons.

Resources. The Center was initially established with a grant awarded to IRCC by HRS. Moreover, HRS contributed to the operation of the Center through a purchase agreement with the college for vocational evaluation, adjustment training and placement services to its clients.

To support the work adjustment training program, the Center operated as a nonprofit business subcontracting with employers in the community to produce and manufacture a number of products related especially to the major industries in the area, fishing and tourism. The funds generated by these contracts were used primarily to pay the wages of the handicapped students.

The community college also supported the program. First, all of the VEA set-aside funds for handicapped students were channeled to the Center and used at the discretion of the director to pay for part of staff salaries or to purchase equipment and materials for the students. Second, as a result of an agreement with the college, the Center was entitled to use all college facilities, including space, typing pool, duplicating machines, furniture, custodial services, and so forth at no cost to the project. In addition, since the Center staff were considered faculty members, all bookkeeping functions related to payroll, insurance and vacations and other fringe benefits were handled by the college financial office at no cost to the program. Finally, the costs related to the use of the IMTS Centers by handicapped students for individualized remedial instructions were not charged to the Center. Of course, as for the CETA clients, the college was reimbursed by the State on the basis of student attendance at the Centers.

Effects. From discussions with a number of individuals at the college and also in the community, it appeared that the Skills Development Center was very successful in providing the transitional services needed by handicapped students to continue further vocational training or find competitive employment. Over 55 percent of the students who participated at the Center either were in on-the-job training programs through HRS or were placed in jobs in the community. Approximately 30 percent were continuing in occupational programs at IRCC. More importantly, however, most were succeeding in the programs and the instructors were very enthusiastic about their participation. Part of the reason was that placement was made after careful assessment of each student's capabilities and interests and a support system was available at the college to provide assistance and to resolve difficulties before they became insurmountable problems. The support of the college for the goals and activities of the Center was also apparent to the faculty and this helped to modify their attitudes and behaviors toward the needs of the handicapped students.

(3) The Individualized Manpower Training System.

The Board of Trustees and the Administration at IRCC had shown unusual interest and concern in the development and establishment of the Individualized Manpower Training System (IMTS) Centers serving academically disadvantaged and limited-English proficient students at the college and in the community. With the approval of the Board, IRCC was one of three Florida IMTS demonstration sites and the only community college pilot-testing the program during the '72-'73 calendar year. Since then, the Division of Vocational-Technical and Adult Education of the State Department of Education had promoted the establishment of IMTS centers into secondary and post-secondary vocational and adult programs. Presently, over 92 IMTS centers were established in Florida, five of which were operated by IRCC--two on the main campus, one at the Indian River Correctional Institution, one in a mobile trailer used to meet the needs of academically disadvantaged students in various satellite locations in the four counties served by the college, and the fifth one, the newest center, at the Florida School for Boys in Okeechobee County, a juvenile institution for Youthful first time offenders ages 11 to 18.

The major goal of IMTS was to provide interested academically disadvantaged students the opportunity to enter and to succeed in vocational education programs by providing individualized programmed instruction in basic education and prevocational skills. In addition to the basic reading, math and language components, complimentary skills included employability behavior programs and career exploratory programs as well as some vocational training programs to motivate students and to assist them in establishing favorable work habits necessary for getting and holding jobs.

Identification and Selection of Students. Approximately 3,000 students participated at the two on-campus IMTS Centers during the past year. The majority of the students needing remedial academic work were referred to the Centers by the Guidance Office and individual instructors at the college, particularly instructors from the vocational/occupational programs.

A number of students were also referred for individualized basic skills training as well as career exploration and prevocational training by the directors of the various college special needs programs, including CETA, the Skills Development Center and the IRCC Women's Education and Employment Training program.

External community agencies could also refer individuals to the IMTS Centers. Included among these agencies were the County Mental Health Center, the Veterans Administration and the Social Security and Employment Offices. Similarly, the public LEAs could also refer students for individualized services at the Centers but, according to one respondent, very few did. In an effort to increase the participation of high school students, the director of the Centers had hired an assistant principal and a guidance counselor, one from each of the two high schools in St. Lucie County, to work as part-time instructional managers at the centers. Finally, any student enrolled at the college or any person in the community could walk into center at any time and request training. One of the unique features of IMTS Centers was the flexibility it provided in terms of open entry and open exit study time and, the staff could, therefore, accommodate the schedules and needs of most clients.

Planning. The IMTS concept was adapted from the procedures developed by the Technical Education Research Center Staff in Montgomery, Alabama, and pilot-tested at the Draper Correctional Center in that State. As the program evolved, much of the materials and procedures were automated and prescribed in guidebooks disseminated by the distributors. Thus, once a host institution decided to implement the program, a technical assistance team assumed total responsibility for organizing the materials, for structuring the work areas and for training the staff who worked as "managers or facilitators of learning" rather than as teachers. Some administrative flexibility existed depending on the location of the site and the clients it served. In most cases, however, there was little or no opportunity for "planning" since most all of the procedures were specified and the activities and materials were programmed, often automated.

In effect then, the nature of the program did not encourage intra-institutional planning with regard to the center's instructional activities. Nevertheless, the director met on a regular basis with the other program directors at IRCC to review administrative procedures and to discuss ways of serving better the special needs populations at the college. One outcome of these meetings was the establishment of a separate IMTS center on campus focusing specifically on academic and prevocationial skills necessary for success in the Allied Health field. The need for this Center was recognized by IRCC administrations when it became apparent that many academically disadvantaged students were excluded systematically from entry into nursing and other allied health careers.

Strategies. The IMTS was totally individualized with the students placed on the basis of diagnostic tests at appropriate levels of instruction and proceeding at their own pace through the programmed curriculum. Periodic assessments were built into the various program components to determine readiness to move to the next level of instruction and, ultimately, to assess readiness for entry into the vocation program of the student's choice.

As indicated, the IMTS program components focused primarily on reading, arithmetic and language skills. However, unlike other programmed instructional systems, the academic curricula were oriented primarily toward vocational courses of study. Thus, students could learn language and math skills and immediately apply the learned concepts to examples drawn directly from their vocational area of interest. Other components included: complimentary skills (e.g., consumer education, health education and personal-social skill training); employability behavior (e.g., punctuality, promptness, job performance, work ethics) and work sampling, providing students prevocational hands-on experiences from different jobs and occupational clusters.

In addition to providing basic remedial instruction to students in preparation for entry into vocational programs, the IMTS served the needs of other students as well. Specific components and individualized courses of study were available for students interested in:

- advanced individualized review in Science, Math, English, Writing and Vocabulary;
- preparation for GED tests administered at IRCC;
- Adult Basic Education;
- Adult Evening High School; and
- English as a Second Language.

By agreement among the four county public LEAs and the Community college, IRCC was designated as the institution administering all Adult Basic Education programs. Although, IRCC offered a number of group-oriented continuing education and adult education evening classes, most of the ABE program was administered through individualized courses of study at the IMTS Centers. The Centers remained open during the week from 8:00 A.M. to 10:30 P.M. and were open as well on Saturday mornings.

Resources. Initial funds to establish and operate the IMTS Centers, including hardware and software purchases and partial staff salaries, were provided by the State Department of Education. Presently, operation of the Centers was supported with a combination of district, state and federal funds. The State contributed to the Centers on the basis of enrollment and attendance as determined by full time equivalencies (FTEs). In addition, money from Adult Basic Education, Federal VEA Part B, set asides for disadvantaged and VEA Section 140 was utilized in support of the Centers.

Effects. Based on respondents' comments, the IMTS Centers had provided an alternative option to a large number of individuals who, because of a variety of factors, were unable to participate and succeed in formal group remedial or special classes. For many, the opportunity to work independently, to observe their own progress and to see the relationship between academic learning and their vocational goals had provided the incentives needed for continued training. While it would be incorrect to suggest that the IMTS was a remedial program for overcoming basic skills deficiencies for all students, it appeared to have increased vocational access for many who had experienced failure with past remedial procedures.

At IRCC, the IMTS was the primary strategy used by the college to provide remedial services to academically disadvantaged students interested in vocational/occupational careers. Moreover, it was a strategy followed by the directors of programs serving other special needs groups whose clients were also academically disadvantaged.

(4) IRCC Women's Education and Employment Training Program.

The Women's Education and Employment Training program was the newest of the special needs programs administered by IRCC. At the time of our visit, the program had completed its first year of operation and plans were underway to expand the program for the coming year. Once again, as was the case with the other special needs programs, the Board and the president supported the effort after the results of a needs assessment. The data showed that many women in the area, in particular displaced homemakers who needed to work in order to support their households, lacked the necessary resources to find employment.

The primary objective of the program, therefore, was to establish a comprehensive support system for older women who were seeking entry or reentry into the work force. A secondary objective was to encourage the women to seek training and employment opportunities in nontraditional fields.

Identification. Approximately 400 women, ages 40 to 60, had participated in the program thus far. Most had found out about the program through informal networks, although some had been referred by college personnel as well as external community agencies such as HRS, the State Employment Service and the League of Women voters. Program activities had also been announced in the college's Continuing Education catalogue as well as in the local media. Respondents indicated that there were many more applicants than could be served, given the size of the staff--the director, a full-time counselor and two part-time instructors.

Planning. As for the other special needs programs, an Advisory Committee was established for the women's program. Its members included representatives from the college, the CETA program and from outside agencies including HRS, the League of Women Voters and local employers.

The pattern for planning program activities seemed to follow that of the other programs as well. That is, the staff assumed major responsibilities for planning and then sought approval of the Advisory Committee and the policymakers prior to implementation. Moreover, as was the case with the other programs, the director, although not a member of the various special needs program advisory councils, met regularly with the other program directors to share and exchange information.

Strategies. The Women's program director was responsible directly to the president. She supervised a staff of three, one counselor and two part-time instructors. Not surprisingly, the program consisted of (1) a series of short duration classes held at the main campus and also at the campus extension centers in Indian River, Martin and Okeechobee counties, and (2) intensive counseling, particularly peer guidance and counseling to provide the necessary support to the clients.

The curriculum content focus for the two-week classes was employability skills. Through a variety of techniques, instructors attempted to increase the confidence of the women as well as to teach them how to write resumes, how to seek employment opportunities, how to behave in a job interview situation, and how to manage their finances. Although there were some attempts to guide women into nontraditional training and occupations, most needed to work within a very short period of time and many came from very traditional backgrounds and were unwilling to consider alternative options. Thus, for most of the women, training was limited to enrollment at the IMTS Centers where they could upgrade their language, math and writing skills, obtain their high school equivalency degree, if needed, and find jobs quickly.

Resources. The IRCC Women's program was totally supported with community college district funds. Thus, the budget was set and approved at the regular College Budget Committee Hearings. The services provided to most women were free, however, for those referred by external agencies such as HRS or CETA, a small fee was charged for participation in the classes. Other external financial resources available to the program were small contributions made by private organizations such as the American Business Women's Association and the Junior Women's Club for scholarships to assist and encourage women to continue their academic and vocational training.

Effects. According to respondents, the response to the program had been overwhelming. Of the total number of women participating in the program (380), approximately 90 were enrolled at the college as students pursuing further training, mostly in the business areas. Sixty-five had found jobs in the community and most were volunteering to act as peer counselors to help other women. Other indicators of success included (1) increased requests for participation, (2) increased interest on the part of women faculty members as well as successful business women in the community to participate as guest speakers and (3) increased recognition of the potential benefits of the program by many women clients of external community agencies, regardless of economic status. To accommodate the increased demand for services, the college planned to expand the program and to schedule more classes for the coming year.

(5) IRCC's Involvement with Programs for the Incarcerated.

Since 1977, IRCC has collaborated with the Florida Department of Corrections (Prisons and Rehabilitation), the County School Board and CETA to provide a comprehensive program for inmates and also for the prison staff at the Indian River Correctional Institution. The institution has been recognized by the American Correctional Council as an exemplary youthful offender institution and the program has been identified as a model "program that works" by researchers at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at the Ohio State University.

The program was described fully in a recent catalogue of Selected Vocational Programs and Practices for Learners with Special Needs (Research and Development Services No. 177) published by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Nevertheless, the research team was able to gather additional data concerning the correctional program from the perspective of IRCC adminstrators that were not reported in the above referenced publication. These data, in addition to information related to the most recent efforts by the college to serve the academic and vocational education needs of the students at the Florida School for Boys, a school for youthful first time offenders ages 11 to 18 in Okeechobee County, are presented below.

Indian River Correctional Institution. The primary purpose of the educational program at the Indian River Correctional Institution was to provide inmates with successful academic and vocational experiences leading to profitable future employment and honorable citizenship. A secondary purpose of the program was to provide a course of study for prison staff leading to more humane treatment of the youthful male offenders.

The educational program serving inmates consisted of (1) remediation in basic skills, (2) prevocational training and guidance for selecting a vocation and (3) occupational training in a variety of trades related to the interests and abilities of the students and also to the employment needs of the community. With regard to the first two activities, the inmates made extensive use of the IMTS Center located at the prison to upgrade their reading and math skills, prepare for GED exams and acquire the vocational prerequisite skills for occupational training. In addition, IRCC offered a number of regularly scheduled classes at the institution in basic English and math skills, science, psychology, health care as well as survival and employability skills. The occupational education program was extensive as well, providing training in more than thirty different trade areas, including automotive repair, small engine repair, drafting, food services and preparation among others.

All programs were competency-based and the courses were taught by regular college instructors who followed the same curriculum as that taught at the college. One of the limitations noted by a respondent was the materials and equipment available at the prison. It was not unusual, he said, for an instructor to load the van and carry needed equipment back and forth from the college in order to conduct the classes and to provide the necessary hands-on experience to the inmates.

In addition to the program for the inmates, IRCC offered a number of courses tailored to the needs of the prison staff. Some of the classes were conducted at the prison, while others were offered at the Vero Beach Campus and were open to the general public as well. The courses at the prison included psychology, health and safety factors and procedures in correctional institutions and the management of public service institutions. According to one respondent, the correctional institution was very supportive of these educational programs for the prison staff and the college viewed its role as "the mediator of tensions between the tough- minded punitive approach and the more humanistic approach in dealing with the rehabilitation of inmates."

The educational as well as the support services available to inmates at Indian River Correctional Institution existed because of the cooperative effort and combined financial support of the county, the community college and CETA. The community college paid for the salaries of the instructors and waived the tuition fees for the student inmates.

Part of the costs to the college were recovered through the full-time equivalent allocations received from the state. However, the college had to make up the balance by budgeting district operating funds and VEA basic and categorical funds targeted to the disadvantaged. A major point of disagreement between the Community College District Board of Trustees and representatives from the State Department of Corrections involved the question of who should be responsible for absorbing the tuition costs and fees related to the education of the inmates. The question had not been resolved and, according to respondents, the differences could affect the future of the program.

The Florida School for Boys. The Florida School for Boys in Okeechobee County, one of the four counties served by IRCC, was an institution for juvenile first time offenders ages 11 to 18. The average stay of the students was about four months. Although the county schools were legally responsible for providing academic and vocational education to the students, the Board and the public school administration had been reluctant to do so. As a result, the Florida State legislation mandated the IRCC to administer the educational programs at the school in cooperation with HRS which was to provide the counseling and rehabilitative support services.

Despite the problems involved in attempting to plan and provide a short-term educational and vocational program for a group of academically heterogeneous students, the IRCC Board of Trustees and administrators accepted the challenge and viewed it as another opportunity to fulfill the college's role as a comprehensive institution serving the needs of its community. At the time of our visit, college administrators were in the process of establishing procedures for administrating and staffing the program and for planning the academic and vocational curricula to be offered at the school.

The focal point of the educational program will be the IMTS Center to be estabilished at the school, operated by IRCC staff. The program will be utilized to provide individualized instruction in the academic areas as well as to provide guidance and prevocational training to the students. A small vocational program will also be offered for students ages 16 to 18. Two factors were taken into consideration in planning the vocational curricula. First, the identification of occupational areas that would lead to profitable employment, not just in the local community, but also in the southernmost part of the state which was home for many of the students. The second consideration was to offer a program that would utilize fully the existing equipment and facilities at the school.

Although the total program involved a collaborative arrangement between the college and HRS, representatives from the two agencies had not yet met to coordinate their efforts. Moreover, no attempts had been made to coordinate planning with the County Board of Education, although, it appeared as if the county schools were relieved to be absolved of their responsibilities.

Funding for the educational program at the Florida School for Boys was provided by the State Department of Education. The funds were allocated on a pass-through basis from the Okeechobee County schools to IRCC. As far as could be determined, local VEA funds had not been used to support the program.

b. Environmental Context.

Indian River Community College is located in Fort Pierre, St. Lucie County, approximately two-thirds of the way down the Florida Peninsula on the east coast. The College, however, served the residents from a four county area including Indian River County to the north, Martin county to the south and Okeechobee County to the west. Tourism and agriculture made up the major industries in the area and, as a result, the economy fluctuated according to the vacation and farming seasons. Nevertheless, there were many new activities supporting a more stable economy including retail markets, a new civic center and a new hospital. The community college played a central role in preparing residents for new job markets in the construction and other related fields as well as in retail sales and merchandise areas.

Established in 1959, IRCC appeared to be a truly comprehensive community college dedicated to meeting the education needs of all residents beyond the secondary level, and in particular, those of special needs population. The District Board of Trustees, in every instance, had supported the development of nontraditional special needs programs whenever the results of formal needs assessments had shown a gap in the services available to these populations. In most cases, the programs were funded as a result of cooperative efforts between the community college and other agencies in the community and the state, in particular, the county public LEAs, CETA and HRS.

Moreover, all projects were designed to support the general policies of "mainstreaming" as much as possible, the special needs students within the regular academic and vocational programs offered by the college. Organizationally, this was achieved by having the directors of each special needs program under one administrative umbrella reporting directly to the Dean of Instructions. Although, none of the directors served officially on each others' advisory committees, they were increasingly involved in informal cross-departmental linkages and information networks. Regularly scheduled meetings provided the forum for vocational, academic, counseling, and special needs program directors to exchange information and to report on new developments, services and procedures available through their programs to all students on campus. The ties existing between the special needs programs and the regular college programs, especially the counseling and support service programs, were clearly evident and provided the major mechanism for accommodating the special needs groups into the regular college programs. The fact that all of the directors had faculty status facilitated these interactions.

c. Effects of Collaborative Efforts.

The willingness shown by the IRCC District Board of Trustees to meet the needs of special groups and to take risks in support of programs targeted to them had established and confirmed the role of the college as the center for fostering the educational, economic and cultural development needs of residents in the community. The perceptions among community leaders of the college's commitments and administrative competence to establish effective programs had led to further participation and opportunities for coordination of services to serve the special needs populations. The recent award to administer the comprehensive CETA programs for St. Lucie County as well as the involvement of the college in the administration of all Adult Basic Education programs in the four-county area and the administration of educational and vocational programs for juvenile offenders were all examples of this type of participation and cross-organizational linkages increasing opportunities to meet the needs of special populations.

The emergence of the community college as the leading institution serving the needs of special groups presented some difficulties as well. The major issue concerned the role of the public LEAs in the county. In contrast to the innovative and expanding role of the community college, the educational and vocational programs in the public schools appeared to be very traditional and limited in scope. The priority focus at the public schools was on teaching the basic skills to students and on preparing them for the Florida State Assessment Tests. The vocational education opportunities for all students were limited to the traditional-type, e.g., agriculture, business and industrial arts programs offered at the two comprehensive high schools. There were no vocational strategies evident to serve academically disadvantaged students and the handicapped students were serviced in separate special education programs.

Moreover, there seemed to be little formal interaction between administrators at the public schools and those at the community college. Except for the CETA Youth programs that were administered by the community college (the public schools opted not to assume administrative responsibility), by accident or design, the dividing line concerning program administrative responsibility seemed to be age. That is, the public schools served the educational needs of students up to the secondary level, and the college met the needs of education beyond the high school level. Indeed, college administrators seemed reluctant to encourage participation of secondary school students at the IMTS Centers for fear that the students might decide to drop out of school and choose to obtain their high school equivalency degree through the programs offered at the Centers. Thus, in order to participate, students under age 17 had to obtain written permission from the high school guidance counselors or principal or show appropriate official documentation that they had dropped out of public schools.

From our analysis, it was difficult to determine why the extent of collaboration between the community college and the public schools was limited considering the coordination efforts between the college and other public and private agencies. One possibility was that the Office of Superintendent of Schools in St. Lucie County was an elected position and the superintendent had campaigned on a platform focused on the needs to "Return to the Basics." As such, his priorities seemed to be directed toward the teaching of reading, writing and quantitative skills. The Superintendent's sole contact with IRCC seemed to be through participation in the Coordinating Council, a state-mandated planning council involving the superintendant from each of the four county LEAs and the college president. The primary issues discussed by this council were those related to the use of Adult Basic Education funds and programs administered by IRCC.

4. The John Wood Community College, Qunicy, Illinois.

a. Description of the Arrangement.

The John Wood Community College District 539 is part of the post-secondary and higher education system of the State of Illinois. It was founded in November 1974, and was approved to offer degrees at the associate level as well as certificates.

The college was controlled by a publicly-elected Board of Trustees. It serviced a basically rural community with the majority of its citizens residing in small to medium-size cities. The college presently offered thirty-seven curricula, in five different fields of instruction, leading to degrees or certificates in the occupational program. It also offered twenty-eight curricula, in five different fields of instruction, leading to degrees in the baccalaureate oriented program.

The college had no central campus, rather, it was essentially an administrative entity that purchased educational and student services from the five proprietary higher education institutions in Adams and Pike counties. This "common market" arrangement, as it is called, permitted the college to: (1) purchase services at the lowest possible price, (2) make extensive use of existing higher education services in the area, (3) reduce the possibility of duplication and redundancy in the offerings among the existing higher education institutions, (4) develop new and other programs which were consistent with the demands of the "market" for those services, and (5) develop new student populations and services as dictated by the college's needs assessment process.

The college was founded in response to action by the legislature of the State of Illinois mandating that all of the state should be included in a community college district. An early proposal called for annexation of Adams and Pike counties into an adjacent community college district. Faced with the choice of annexation or establishment of a separate district, the eleven public school districts created a coordinating committee to study the problem. The committee worked with representatives of five non-public post-secondary educational institutions in the area to develop a contractual common market college for west central Illinois. The motives behind the common market approach were: (a) cost avoidance associated with capital development, (b) diversity of educational resources and flexibility of operation, and (c) attitude of the citizenry to any operation that would weaken the existing colleges and vocational schools.

Thus, the John Wood Community College was an administrative entity that purchased educational and student services from existing higher education institutions in the area. The five attendance centers from which services were purchased included: Quincy College, Culver-Stockton College, Hannibal-LaGrange College, Southeastern Iowa Community College, and the Open Learning Center of the John Wood Community College.

The college was a public, tax-supported institution, receiving financial support from state and local (district) sources which accounted for almost 73 percent of all operating revenues. The remaining operating revenue was composed almost entirely of student tuition and fees and chargebacks paid by other community colleges and non-district territories. In addition to annual operation funds, the college had been successful in acquiring many restricted purpose equipment and salary monies from both state and federal sources. To date, these financial resources had been more than adequate to provide the necessary services to fulfill the mission of the institution.

Additionally, the District had been able to acquire a comfortable fund balance for the purpose of avoiding large capital indebtedness should the need arise for modest facility development. Since its inception, the college sought to utilize existing community and area resources for the provision of instruction. The original Board of Trustees made a commitment to utilize, where possible, the "common market" method of instructional delivery so long as the college could continue to purchase quality instruction at a reasonable price. This procedure continues through contracts with four institutions: Quincy College, Culver-Stockton College, Hannibal-LaGrange College, and Southeastern Community College of Iowa, all of which were fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and

Schools. The proprietary institutions with which the college contracts for occupational programs were accredited by the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools and other agencies appropriate for the kinds of programs available. In addition, the Illinois Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education evaluated all occupational programs provided by the college.

In addition to the instruction provided through the common market, the College provided a number of its own programs of instruction. During 1978-79, nearly 15 percent of the College's instruction was made through Outreach, Licensed Practical Nursing, and Agriculture programs. The College had been able to provide programs of nontraditional and developmental education. Through the Open Learning Center operations at the College's administrative facility, the renovated East School of Pittsfield, carefully supervised nontraditional programs of individualized instruction were available for students whose needs and work schedules did not permit enrollment in traditional courses. In 1978-79, over eight percent of the credit hours generated in the instruction program involved nontraditional courses.

The College also provided opportunities for high school students to experience college work during the senior year of high school. Through the escrow program, students could enroll for college credit in certain general education courses taught at four high school locations throughout the District. In addition, the fine arts program had made cultural opportunities available for high school students enrolled at seven high schools in the District.

Instructional Services. All instruction provided by the College was delivered under the auspices of the Dean of Academic Affairs and the Director of Occupational Education. In order to augment the resources available at the common market institutions, the College had hired additional personnel to implement more specialized programs of occupational instruction; these administrators assisted the Director of Occupational Education. As a result of the diversity permitted by the common market delivery system, the College had an eclectic and comprehensive set of course offerings. Presently, students could select from among 627 state-approved courses for college credit. The College offered 23 areas of concentration leading to the

Associate in Arts degree, 11 areas of concentration leading to the Associate in Science degree, 15 Associate of Applied Science degree programs, and 37 certificate programs. Because of the common market operation, JWCC students had access to a varied instructional staff. With the contractual delivery system and the College's commitment to augment available educational resources through additional staff hirings, the College compared favorably with area community colleges in terms of comparative backgrounds among the faculty.

Student Services. The Student Services division was primarily responsible for recruiting, admitting, and caring for students. Because of the common market delivery system, providing services to students was more complex than at a typical community college and required a considerable degree of organization and cooperation among the College and common market staff. However, both the structure and functions of Student Services at the College resembled a typical community college. Services available included those of: public information, recruitment, admissions, orientations, advising, counseling, placement, financial aids, registration, student records, veterans affairs, student government and activities, data processing, and institutional research.

The John Wood Community College was committed to the philosophy of "providing equal educational opportunities to all residents of the District through an open door policy, whereby educational experiences were available to all who may profit from them; assistance shall be offered to potential and enrolled students in establishing educational objectives that are commensurate with their aptitudes, interests, and abilities."[1]

Policies for recruitment and admission of students had been developed and implemented at the College. Additionally, JWCC counselors worked with area high school counselors and principals, and JWCC instructors in agriculture, nursing, and business had developed close relationships with their counterparts in education, business, and industry. Student Services personnel were available to area high schools for specialized testing of students, faculty workshops, and student assemblies, in addition to school visitations throughout the academic year.

---

[1] Self Study Report, John Wood Community College, (Quincy, Ill.: John Wood Community College, Autumn, 1979), p. 56.

Efforts to recruit adults and high school dropouts were extensive and included bulk mailings to nearly all homes in the District, informational booths at five annual county fairs, displays for special events in the Quincy Mall, regular contact with social service agencies, counseling for Adams County Jail inmates, presentations to area clubs and organizations, and provisions for evening and Saturday availability of admissions and counseling personnel. The College also conducted annual information days for area counselors, principals, superintendents, district social service agencies, and the news media.

Admission of students was monitored on a continuous basis; those high schools that appeared to be lagging in acceptances, especially for the fall term, were visited by the College staff. A study of 1978 high school graduates within the District revealed that 47 percent had furthered their education beyond high school with half of those (23 percent) attending the College; thus, approximately one out of four seniors from the District was attending the College immediately after graduation.

Criteria for admission were specifically mandated by the Illinois Community College Board policies; in general, any district resident who was either 18 years of age or a high school graduate could enroll at the College. However, a student could not enroll in any program he or she pleased; enrollment in educational programs offered by the College was determined by criteria established by the staff and approved by the Board of Trustees. Except for programs with state-mandated requirements, such as practical nursing and cosmetology, the criteria were not usually restrictive.

The College offered courses in 44 locations during the 1978-79 school year; this was illustrative of a commitment by the College to offering high quality, reasonably priced programs within close proximity of the students. No student resided more than 20 minutes from an attendance center. In no programs were students restricted to starting their course on only one annual date; even the practical nursing program offered two starting dates each year.

Admissions reports, enrollment reports, and follow-up studies of high school students all indicated that the objectives of the admissions process were generally achieved and that recruitment and admission of targeted groups such as women, Blacks, and veterans had been successful. The Trustees of the College had a commitment to effective orientation, counseling, and advising services for students by providing both staff and programs to carry out this mission of the College.

Prospective students who applied to the College at least two weeks prior to the registration date for the program in which they were interested were encouraged to attend an orientation program and pre-register, or in some cases, register for classes. During the summer months this program was called Summer Orientation and Registration (SOAR); it has proved to be both effective and popular with students, as evidenced by its low dropout rate (less than 23 percent from the beginning of the freshman to the beginning of the sophomore year), and positive evaluations by students. The common market approach required that students have a clear knowledge and understanding of the system. Student Services staff members provided detailed and careful explanations to students regarding what to plan for and expect at the College.

As at most colleges, the costs incurred as a result of college participation were a major concern. The College provided the usual range of state and federal financial aid programs; in addition, the College had developed a scholarship program for part-time students, student talent awards, and an emergency loan fund. For the 1978-79 school year, about two-thirds of the full-time students received financial aid equal to or exceeding tuition and fees at the College. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission Annual Report showed that the College ranked third among Illinois Community Colleges for the percentage of full-time students receiving Illinois State Grants during 1978-79. While the high local unemployment rate played a role in the large number of students that qualified, there was some evidence to indicate that the financial aids information program was partially responsible for the high enrollment rates.

College staff worked very closely with high school counselors and social service agency personnel in providing up-to-date information about financial aids. Financial counseling was also important since most students, including adults, had difficulty financing their education and paying for their ordinary living expenses as well. Consistent with its mission of "providing a comprehensive program of auxiliary services for students," the College assumed an obligation to assist students before and after they left college, regardless of their reasons for leaving.

Part-time and full-time placement services were provided to students and graduates. The services were advertised in the student newsletter, on job posters, and in a placement brochure. Full-time placement services were shared with the contractual schools, especially Gem City College and Quincy Technical Schools; while these two schools were primarily responsible for placement of JWCC graduates who had taken a majority of their classes at their schools, they were not responsible for school-leavers or students attending other JWCC locations.

Community Services. From the outset, the College's Board and professional staff believed that a community-based educational philosophy was and should be integrated throughout the College's operations. While the Division of Community Services was responsible for the mechanics of community service programs, the JWCC Board and four administrative divisions were deeply committed to an educational philosophy that embraced a variety of community-based approaches. First, the College was committed to providing courses as close to the students' homes as possible. This accounted for the establishment of permanent College centers in four communities within the District and a continuing effort to open additional centers when prospective students were identified. Each center was supervised by a person who lived in or near the community called a center coordinator.

Second, the College also provided a comprehensive set of public service programs consisting of community service activities and community educational activities. Community service activities consisted of workshops, performances, seminars, fine arts activities, and conferences. Community educational opportunities consisted of noncredit courses that were instructional in nature, but not part of a degree or certificate program.

b. Environmental Context.

The Feasibility Study for a West Central Illinois Community College District, prepared under the director to the SBCC, listed three principles that led to the request that the common market be used: (a) cost avoidance associated with capital development, (b) diversity of educational resources and flexibility of operation; and (c) attitude of the citizenry to any operation that would weaken the existing colleges and vocational schools. The educational service contracts, that constitute the legal underpinnings of the common market system, made available well-established baccalaureate-oriented and occupational-oriented programs to JWCC students. More specifically, the contracts provided for the purchase of both educational services and student activity privileges from the contracting institutions. The former included formal instruction, counseling, administration, assistance in placement and use of the physical plant, including the libraries. The latter included all student activities available to the contracting institution's own students. As of the 1976-77 contractual year, a provision was added that extended the term of the contract eighteen months beyond its expiration so that JWCC students could complete their studies. Recently, JWCC expanded the common market by developing an educational service contract with a local industry; it was expected that other such contracts would be developed in the future.

The rate of payment for educational services historically was established through negotations on an institution-by-institution basis. Originally JWCC sought to base contractual rates on program cost data from each institution, as recommended by the first North Central Association evaluation team. However, the requisite cost-data had not been made available to JWCC. In lieu of actual cost-data from the contracting institutions, JWCC had been guided by the statewide net instructional cost figure for community colleges in Illinois; this figure was used as a benchmark for determining cost-effectiveness of the JWCC operation. In the 1976-77 contract variable rate structures were introduced; this, in effect, established the per credit hour cost to JWCC as a function of the total number of JWCC credit hours produced at a particular contracting institution within the contract year. Commencing with the 1979-80 contract year, several of the contracts included provisions that indexed the rate structure over a two-year period.

The JWCC was first issued recognition status on April 18, 1975, effective through the end of the 1974-75 college year. The FY 1976 recognition visit by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) occurred in June, 1975. The ICCB noted considerable interest in and support for the common market approach. However, the report took cognizance of the local Board of Trustees' passage of a resolution that if educational opportunities could not be offered on a contractual basis, consideration would be given to the employment of staff for needed programs. The report also noted the area of community education, stating that the college had not addressed itself well to any campus or extension services. However, despite these remarks, JWCC received full recognition for FY 1976.

The FY 1977 recognition visit was held in July 1976. No concerns surfaced as a result of the visitation and JWCC was awarded full recognition. The FY 1978 recognition visit was held in May 1977. The report of that visit noted that there was evidence of excellent planning and development as witnessed by the needs assessment, determination of goals, and a high sense of purpose. Recommendations from the ICCB included attention to developing policies and procedures on curriculum development and testing and counseling. JWCC complied with all recommendations and the college was awarded full recognition for FY 1978 in August 1977.

Commencing with FY 1979, the ICCB initiated a six-year recognition cycle. JWCC will carry full recognition through FY 1983, when the College will undergo its next recognition evaluation.

Very early in the College's history, JWCC developed a formal written statement of administrative philosophy. In attempting to realize such a philosophy, the JWCC administration had given staff members complete, autonomous responsibility for program growth. To that extent, the College was attempting to develop managers of the learning process rather than dichotomize the staff along traditional faculty and administrative lines.

The Board of Trustees from its inception had taken a strong leadership role in developing and maintaining an effective administrative structure. The Board actively recruited the charter president and was heavily involved in the selection of other key personnel during beginning stages of the College's development.

In 1974, after district boundaries were formed, 28 candidates filed for the October 26 election. All seven candidates who were elected had expressed commitment to developing a "common market" college. It is interesting to note that all members of the original Board lived outside of the immediate Quincy area. Five of the original Board members were elected from Pike County, which had a population of roughly one-third that of Adams County.

c. Outcomes/Effects/Problems Related to the Collaborative Effort.

Based on data for students enrolled in classes during the 1978-79 Fall term, the profile of those receiving services was as follows:

1. Thirty-four percent were full-time students (12 semester hours in a semester term or 8 semester hours in a quarter term): sixty-six percent were part-time.
2. Sixty percent were women.
3. Seventy percent were freshmen, 13 percent were sophmores, and 17 percent were unclassified.
4. Fifty-one percent of the full-time students were enrolled in transfer programs, 49 percent were enrolled in occupational programs.
5. Sixty-four percent of the part-time students were enrolled in transfer programs, 16 percent were enrolled in occupational programs, 4 percent were enrolled in remedial/developmental programs, and 16 percent were enrolled in general studies courses.
6. Three and seven-tenths percent were in racial minority categories; of those, 60 percent were black.
7. Ninety-four percent were District residents; 6 percent were non-District residents.
8. Seventy-eight percent of the students were taking the majority of their classes during the day, while 22 percent were taking the majority of their classes in the evenings; 87 percent of all credit hours were generated during the day, and 13 percent were generated during the evenings.
9. The average age for the full-time males was 21.7 years; for the full-time females, 22.2 years; for the part-time males, 27.4 years; for the part-time females, 26.8 years. The overall average age was 29.8 years; 9.4 percent of the students were over the age of 60 years.
10. Seventy-five percent of the students resided in Adams County, 16 percent in Pike County, 4 percent in Hancock County, 2

percent from Brown County, and 4 percent from 38 other Illinois counties.

11. Approximately 40 students resided in the residence halls at Quincy College, 45 at Culver-Stockton College and 16 at Hannibal-Lagrange College.
12. Surveys by Quincy College and JWCC revealed that 68-70 percent of the students would not be attending the common market colleges directly if JWCC did not exist.
13. Roughly two-thirds of all full-time students received grants or scholarships equal to or exceeding JWCC tuition charges; over 300 part-time students also received financial aid; financial aid to students for FY 1980 exceeded $1,100,000.

The College had made excellent progress since its inception. The concept of a comprehensive common market system, once merely an idea, had proved to be capable of delivering quality education at a reasonable cost to the residents of the District. The College's success was attested to by the rapid growth of the institution from 400 students in the Fall of 1975 to over 3500 full-time and part-time students in the Spring of 1979. The College's commitment to being a full-service, community-based institution had been realized through cooperative educational endeavors with business, industry and community agencies. Further, it has served as an educational catalyst, bringing new programs to the area in response to educational needs, encouraging cooperation among educational institutions, introducing innovative concepts such as the escrow program for high school students, and acting as the motivating force behind the new Quincy Area Education Consortium.

In short, the College has been successful in:

- proving the soundness of the common market concept,
- placing the institution on a sound financial base,
- developing long-term educational and contractual relationships, and,
- developing a strong base of community support.

The problems that the College had identified as requiring attention were:

- strengthening the operation of the college,

- solidifying the common market,
- expanding the community-based philosophy,
- emphasizing programs for the new students of post-secondary education,
- meeting the challenge of public demands for accountability, and
- dealing with the challenges posed by changing energy sources.

The Colleges proposed to develop a variety of strategies to allow it to survive through the coming years. In addressing these problems in its Self-Study report, the College specified the various strategies it planned to employ in resolving these problems.

With regard to problems concerning the operation of the College, efforts were continuing to refine the methods of institutional research, by using better coordinated research, planning, and development strategies. Additionally, efforts were made to involve the community at earlier stages of problem identification and resolution. Further, the College planned to develop a program for working with the high schools that would involve greater articulation between and among various program and project staffs.

To resolve problems related to the common market strategy, the College planned to develop a better mechanism for presenting and explaining the concept, which was still not well understood. It will also attempt to expand its market, where possible and feasible, and to develop contingency plans in the event of the possible breakdown of contractual relationships. Finally, in this area, the College viewed the role of the newly-formed Quincy Area Education Consortium as essential, especially in the area of overall program planning for all education agencies in the Consortium.

To achieve the objective of expansion for the community-based philosophy, the College planned to strengthen community involvement by investigating the use of community facilities and services for cooperative ventures. It also planned to work with local officials to make educational opportunities available to potential industry, and, thus, play a significant role in the possible industrial revitalization of the area.

Like most post-secondary institutions, the College realized that the profile of the post-secondary student was undergoing a radical change. The College planned to emphasize the development of programs for these new students who may come to it for service by expanding existing traditional programs and services that were aimed primarily at the adult learner, expanding nontraditional programs and offerings aimed at the traditional adult learner, and assisting some of the traditional-oriented contractual schools to deal with the changes suggested by the decreasing numbers of traditional college students.

In meeting the challenge of public demands for accountability, the College planned to continue its common market strategy as long as feasible. In the event that the establishment of a permanent facility became necessary, the College planned to utilize its fund balance to match state capital funds in order to avoid requesting funds from local taxpayers.

Lastly, in attempting to deal with the challenges that will be presented by changing energy sources, the College planned to establish a trades construction program in order to integrate training in construction with the need for development of energy efficient model structures, to support research into the development of alternative energy sources, and to explore means of establishing a transportation network throughout the District.

5. Career Intern Program, Poughkeepsie, New York.

a. Description of Arrangement.

The Career Intern Program (CIP) was an alternative high school, serving students between the ages of 16 and 21 who had dropped out of high school or who were at serious risk of doing so. The Program provided an educational arrangement allowing students to pursue both their academic and career-related programs in a unique fashion. The Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC), Poughkeepsie, New York, sponsored one of four demonstration models of the CIP developed by OIC of America, Philadelphia, PA. The CIP accepted "potential" dropouts from the City of Poughkeepsie and surrounding district systems in four counties in the Hudson Valley area of east-central New York State. The Program attempted to meet the needs of these various school systems by providing an alternative educational environment to those students who were not doing well in school, and would probably drop out before graduation. It was the only alternative program for "dropouts" and "potential dropouts" in the Hudson Valley area. As the Director of the program stated: "It's either us of the streets for this kind of student."

Students enrolled in the program came from four school districts and the public schools of the City of Poughkeepsie. County districts were: Beacon, Arlington, Millbrook, and Hyde Park. Under the arrangement, OIC/CIP was considered as an extension of each of the respective school districts. Of the students in the program, 60 percent were from Poughkeepsie, 20 percent from Beacon, and the remaining 20 percent from the districts of Arlington, Millbrook, and Hyde Park. Forty percent were "dropouts" and the other 60 percent were "potential" dropouts.

The Hudson Valley OIC negotiated a contract with each of the districts, allowing it to provide educational and vocational services to the target populations. Since regulations and policies for each of the school districts varied considerably, the negotiations process proved to be very lengthy. For example, in the case of the Poughkeepsie Public Schools, since the instructional staff was unionized, the contract with Hudson Valley OIC contained the provision that for every 25 students from the Poughkeepsie School system in the program, a teacher from that system had to be hired by the CIP as a part of its staff with the benefits compatible with those of the city system, not the Program's. The two members of the CIP faculty who were Poughkeepsie Public School employees stationed at the Program received benefits comparable to their seniority and positions in the school system, despite personnel procedures established for the CIP program.

Funding for the program came primarily from the U.S. Department of Labor's Youth Employment Program (YEDPA P.L. 95-93 funds). Other funds came from the participating school systems, and were essentially contributions "in kind" and "in services." For example, the Poughkeepsie Public Schools provided for lunches for its students, for the use of the high school facilities such as the gymnasium and swimming pool, and the loan of athletic and other sports equipment during the regular school sessions.

Students who were interested in the program could express their desire to participate to the guidance counselor at their respective high school. In some cases, students were identified by other school personnel on the basis of patterns of attendance, poor performance in classes, discipline problems, or a combination of all these.

To be accepted into the program, students had to meet the entrance requirement of a fifth grade level of achievement in reading and mathematics. All who met the requirements and wished to enter were then pooled and participants were selected by lottery at specific times each year. Those not accepted into the program were placed in a "control" group and their performance was followed up independently along with that of the "treatment" group in the program, by an independent evaluation team (see "Environmental Context" for further explanation).

Interestingly, those students from the surrounding county school districts who participated in the program tended to be primarily non-minority and middle class "dropouts," while those from the Poughkeepsie Public Schools tended to be primarily minority and low-income. Thus, the program was providing services to a group of students from various school districts, for whom no services existed or were planned for their respective schools.

When a student had been admitted to the CIP, he or she met with a guidance counselor to develop both an academic and a career individualized plan. Using data from the respective high school regarding performance standardized tests in reading and mathematics, as well as information culled from the initial interview with the student, the student and counselor developed jointly the student's academic and career/vocational program plan. If students were uncertain about their career plans, then placement in career-related activities was done at the discretion of the counselor.

All classes were small, usually no nore than 10 students. As a result, students were able to receive considerable individualized attention from faculty and other staff members. For one-half day, students pursued a highly structured curriculum, focusing on the academic development of basic skills. The afternoon was devoted to career developmental activities. These were structured to take students through a series of activities related to the development of awareness about career and vocational opportunities, assessment of self, and development of plans for achieving one's chosen career or vocation through exploration of options available in the Hudson Valley area. Finally, the activities culminated with placement of the students as interns in one or more career or career-related areas of their choice.

A significant difference in the career-vocational developmental aspect of the program was that the internship began almost immediately, rather than being delayed until one's senior or last year in the program. This was quite different from most work experience or cooperative work programs administered by many vocational education programs in public school systems. In these programs, cooperative education seldom began before the junior or senior years.

In addition to the regular instruction and unique career-developmental activities, the program also provided a variety of student services. For example, because of the in-kind contributions by the Poughkeepsie Public School system, there was an athletic program available to CIP students. The program made extensive use of the gymnasium and swimming pool at the local high school. Moreover, students had their own intramural athletic activities.

b. Environmental Context.

The Career Intern Program was an alternative high school program serving low-income youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who had dropped out of their regular high school or who were at serious risk of doing so. Developed in 1969 by the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc., (OIC/A), the project achieved notable success in helping youths graduate from secondary school and in smoothing their transition from school to work to further technical training, or to post-secondary education.

In its developmental stages, it was funded exclusively by the National Institute of Education (NIE). In 1976, the prototype program operating in Philadelphia was judged to be exemplary by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) of the U.S. Office of Education and the NIE. Under authorization of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Acts of 1978, DOL elected to field test the CIP in four localities to find out if the same beneficial outcomes that had been observed in Philadelphia could be achieved in the new sites. DOL funded the dissemination efforts, and through an interagency agreement, arranged to have the NIE monitor both the dissemination process and the evaluation of the program at the four sites selected for demonstration, with sponsorship under the Hudson Valley OIC. The contract for the evaluation of activities at all sites was awarded to the RMC Research Corporation, Mountain View, California, in April, 1978, by the NIE, pursuant to the interagency agreement between the Institute and the Department of Labor.

Once chosen as one of the four sites, the Hudson Valley OIC then undertook to contract with the five districts to deliver services to the dropout population. As a condition for selection, agreement to participate by each of the school districts had to be secured. However, the completion of the contractual agreements with each district could not be completed until subsequent to the contract award. In the case of Hudson Valley OIC, contracting activities commenced after the award. OIC/A provided its own legal staff as consultants to the various sites, when negotiations proved to be difficult. For Hudson Valley OIC, negotiations with the county district school systems proceeded quickly. Those with the Poughkeepsie Public Schools did not fare as well.

Negotiations with the Poughkeepsie Public Schools delayed the implementation of the CIP by six months. The local chapter of the AFT, the union representing the teachers of the city system, opposed the program because of job-related issues affecting its members. The final arrangement with the Poughkeepsie Public School system, therefore, had to accommodate the many demands made by the local union. These included:

- A faculty position for Poughkeepsie Public School teachers according to seniority and at the salary level for the city system.
- One faculty person to be hired by the CIP for every 25 students from the Poughkeepsie Public Schools enrolled in the program.
- Pay differentials to be paid at the city rate for any teaching lead in excess of the number of school days for the city system.

These conditions proved to be costly and troublesome for the Program. The pay scale for the Program was substantially less than that paid by the Poughkeepsie Public School system. Additionally, because the program is year-long, teachers hired received their pay, plus the summer differential. The program also had no choice in the selection of the teachers from the Poughkeepsie system; they were selected on the basis of seniority in that system.

Initially, there was hostility between the faculty members from the Poughkeepsie system and those hired by the Program. Given that classes were much smaller than those in the city system (10 as compared to 25 or

30) and given the year-round nature of the program, other faculty members felt that those from the Poughkeepsie system were taking advantage of the Program. However, the Program had to agree to the conditions in order to implement the exemplary model. Negotiations lasted more than six months, thus delaying the planned opening of the program until late in the school year of 1979-80. However, the eventual start of the program was significant in that it represented the first program for this population in the Hudson Valley areas.

The definition of the population to be serviced by program posed another problem. Each district defined "dropout" and "potential dropout" differently. Early in contract negotiations, OIC officials discovered there was no commonly understood operational definition of these populations. Hence, it accepted the differing definitions, since attempts to develop one that was universally acceptable proved futile.

Criteria for entry into the program proved to be still another problem. As service providers, OIC had difficulty dealing with the experimental nature of the program. The requirement that all students who came to the Program not be accepted, but that entry be conditioned upon the lottery created some ethical problems for the Program's leadership. However, the Program agreed to the experimental "control group"/"treatment group" requirement, since it felt: (1) that the outcomes would be favorable and the program would be able to expand eventually to service all who came to it; and, (2) since there was no service for this population in the entire Hudson Valley area, it was better to have something than nothing.

No formal prior institutional relationships existed among the various school districts relative to this population before the program. However, there is a Bureau of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) which services Dutchess County, the county in which all the districts are located. BOCES provided vocational education services to some tenth graders, but primarily eleventh and twelfth graders, and all handicapped students who needed special education services not provided by the local school districts. Each district had a representative to the governing board of BOCES, Dutchess County.

The major leadership thrust for the Program came from the Executive Director of the Hudson Valley OIC. The Director had secured a national and local reputation through her leadership of the Hudson Valley OIC in providing vocational and occupational training to low-income populations in Dutchess County, New York. OIC was the major recipient of Dutchess County Department of Human Resource funding in the Hudson Valley area. It was the primary service provider of vocational/occupational and manpower training in the area. Its creation came about as a result of an absence of services in this region for low-income populations, as related to manpower and vocational/occupational training. Because The Executive Director had been a social activist in the area for many years and had enjoyed a respected reputation, she was able to use her influence to convince county and city school districts of the need for the CIP and to assure their participation in the Program.

The populations receiving services differed considerably though they all manifested the same condition. Those from the Poughkeepsie Public Schools were primarily minority (Black) and low-income with school histories that reflected one or more of the following conditions: academic achievement of at least two years or more below grade level in reading and mathematics, social behavior problems, high rate of absenteeism and, at least age 16 by grade ten. For those coming from the county school districts, the characteristics were generally: non-minority and middle-income. Education/achievement levels tended to be at or above grade level; however, most had attendance and discipline problems, and exhibited generally inappropriate behavior in school.

c. Effects and Problems Related to Collaborative Effort.

The Program had been underway for just a little over one-half year when visited by researchers, hence no achievement data or success rates regarding completion of the program were available. However, the program did have attendance data that showed that the holding power of the program, in terms of average daily attendance, was about 90 percent. It could be inferred, therefore, that at the time of the visit, the program was experiencing some success in servicing the students, as manifested by their continued participation.

There was still some concern about the consequences of the negotiation process with the Poughkeepsie Public Schools and the conditions imposed by the local chapter of AFT in order to get the program operational.

Program staff, not employed by the Public Schools of Poughkeepsie, felt that the local union was "having its cake and eating it, too." It was pointed out that the existence of the program benefited both the local school system and the union, but proved to be costly to the Program. For example, since the Program was considered as an extension of each of the various school systems, the participation of their respective groups of students in the Program meant that state funds which were reimbursed to the LEAs according to Average Daily Attendance rate (ADA) had increased. For the local union, it meant two additional job slots for its membership, under favorable conditions.

The future of the program was yet to be determined. It was understood that the program would ultimately be incorporated within the respective school systems after the model had run the course of its demonstration funding period. Given the size of this subgroup of students (very small in the county school districts and moderate for the Poughkeepsie Public Schools), it was uncertain whether the districts wanted to continue the present arrangement and contract with OIC for services, or incorporate the model within their respective systems.

At the time researchers were on site, there were no apparent problems regarding the arrangement between OIC and the county districts. There were concerns voiced by Poughkeepsie faculty who were stationed in the Program that the Program should have been operated by the Public Schools of Poughkeepsie with the YEDPA funds. If this is representative, then, it may be that there was lingering antipathy between the local teachers union and the Program. This concern, however, was not voiced by local school administrators, when interviewed about the Program. Their views were positive. Their major concern was that, given the financial character of the school district, characterized as "strained," the problem was going to be securing funds to incorporate the Program within the high school program once federal funding was no longer present.

On the other hand, CIP leadership indicated some awareness of the concerns of Poughkeepsie Public Schools faculty on the Program's instructional staff. Its concern was that the Program was "damned if it did, damned if it did not." As was explained, it was OIC which lobbied for and finally got the program for a population of students that was not served adequately before. Now, however, after securing funds and operating the Program, local school personnel were arguing that they should be the ones to operate it because they could do a better job. Program representatives also stated that the problems experienced in negotiations were reflective of the larger problems some school systems had in servicing subgroups of students, especially those bored by traditional instruction, and, in some cases, low-income, minority students. The refusal on the part of some school systems to recognize the special needs of these students and provide appropriate alternatives was, in the CIP's opinion, a major aspect of the failure of many school districts to achieve equity of education outcomes for all of its students.

6. The Chicago Urban Skills Institute, City Wide Colleges of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

a. Description of Arrangement.

The Chicago Urban Skills Institute was one of nine units of the City Colleges of Chicago system. Its major mission was to provide adult educational services to persons who did not possess either a secondary diploma or General Educational Development (GED) credential, and to prepare adults for entry-level employment in one of several fields of employment for which the Institute provided training. The mission came directly from the assigned mission of the public community colleges to: (1) provide career education, including occupational/vocational, technical, and semi-technical fields, (2) provide job training, retraining and/or upgrading of skills to meet individual, local and state manpower needs, and (3) provide general studies, including preparatory or developmental instruction, adult basic education, and general education designed to meet individual educational needs.

Under this arrangement, all students who manifested such conditions of educational disadvantagement were eligible to receive service at the Skills Institute. Additionally, this arrangement allowed for the cost-effective delivery of training services to the various subgroups who, in addition, could be receiving support from other manpower and social service agencies. Thus, the arrangement provided for the coordination of the delivery of services by arraying the various funding sources needed.

The creation of the special college came about as a direct result of the recognition on the part of other member colleges in the City College System that the separate delivery of the same services to the same populations was dysfunctional. Prior to its inception, a variety of separate but related programs were housed across the member colleges. This dispersion prevented coordination of services and their effective delivery. It also created many problems regarding the accounting for costs to the variety of sponsors: the CETA program of the City of Chicago, the Adult education and other programs supported by the State of Illinois, and the various subsidized programs sponsored by other local, state, and federal agencies.

There were three administrative units within the Urban Skills Institute: The William L. Dawson Skill Center, The Northside Skill Center, and the Adult Learning Skills Center. Each had a specific mission; combined, they allowed the Urban Skills Institute to fulfill its mission of applying educational resources to the needs of a student population that was educationally and economically disadvantaged.

The William L. Dawson Skill Center. The Dawson Skill Center was developed to:

- provide qualifying students with realistic opportinities to acquire marketable skills in a variety of occupational areas sufficient for entry level or higher level employment;
- provide an opportunity for the development of work habits and job attitudes necessary for successful interpersonal relationships and permanent employment;
- provide limited opportunities for the development and demonstration of leadership qualities to enhance trainees' opportunities to service their respective communities;
- provide individuals with the opportunity to develop academically and socially through general studies, in order to assure employability, employment success, better understanding of self and community, improved relationships with others, and greater understanding of urban society; and,
- develop and operate the CETA-sponsored Skills Training Improvement Program.

Services available to trainees, while enrolled at the Center, also included child care, counseling, guidance and placement services, and financial aid. Supportive services were also provided by the Illinois State Employment Service and the Department of Human services of the City of Chicago.

Northside Skill Center. The Northside Skill Center was under construction at the time of the site visit, and will function in the same manner as the Dawson Center, but in the north quadrant of the city.

Adult Learning Skills Program. The Adult Learning Skills Program was designed to:

- provide a wide range of general academic, vocational/occupational courses and programs in a variety of city-wide locations and at various times during the day, afternoons, and evenings for the clientele;
- serve the needs of a large number of adults who resided in the community college district of the city of Chicago and who, for a variety of reasons, had not completed either elementary or secondary school; and,
- provide educational experiences to academically disadvantaged persons commensurate with their skills, abilities, and desires to benefit from the programs offered.

The offerings under the Adult Skills Programs ranged from English language training for those who needed it, to Adult Basic Education courses, GED test preparation in both Spanish and English, computer-assisted instruction, and GED preparation via public television.

The City Colleges of Chicago was under the governance of a seven member voting board, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council of Chicago. The Board of Trustees of Community College District 508, Cook County, State of Illinois, was legally authorized to maintain and operate a Class I Junior College, as defined in Illinois State legislation. The officers of the Board were the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer. The Chancellor was the chief executive officer of the Board and the Colleges, having the responsibility of recommending to the Board the appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, transfer, suspension and dismissal of all personnel, except the Attorney and the Secretary. The Chancellor had charge and control of all departments and employees (except the Attorney and Secretary) and was responsible for all purchases, equipment and supplies, contracts, leases, buildings and grounds, the acquisition and condemnation of sites, the erection, construction, maintenance and repair of facilities and equipment, and the supervision of the faculty, curriculum and student body of the Colleges. In addition to the Chancellor, the Board also appointed, upon recommendation of the Chancellor, other administrative officers including college presidents. The vice chancellors, along with the college presidents, were Officers of the District and served as advisors to the Chancellor.

The central administration of the City Colleges of Chicago had the overall responsibility for the operation of the Colleges. The President of the Chicago Urban Skills Institute was appointed by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the Chancellor. The President, in addition to being an Officer of the District, was the chief administrative officer of the College Institute. The Institute's vice president, directors and other administrators were appointed by the Board upon recommendation by the President to the Chancellor.

Sources of Funding. The Chicago Urban Skills Institute received its funding through the charter of its parent organization, the City Colleges of Chicago. Funding to support the Chicago Urban Skill's Manpower Programs was provided by the Comprehensive Education and Training Act (CETA) and the Illinois State Department of Public Aid. All CETA contracts were developed and monitored by the Illinois State Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

The remaining funding for the Institute was from state and local taxes, including some monies from the Illinois Community College Board, generated by the computation of student credit hours. Additional funds were obtained from registration fees. The ratio of funding from each of these sources varied and was determined by the legislation and the availability of funds.

Because activities and operations within the Institute were located within the various centers and programs, this section addresses the activities and operations of the Institute as part of the centers.

William L. Dawson Skill Center. The Center was one of the oldest components of the Urban Skills Institute and was charged with providing qualified individuals, in need of training, with realistic opportunities to acquire marketable skills in a variety of occupational areas. In addition, it provided for the development of work habits and attitudes and the development of related general and academic studies that could enhance the students' employment potential.

The Center's main campus was administered by a Director who had responsibility for all programs and operations, and who was accountable to the Executive Vice President of the Institute. Programs within the Center were arranged in clusters, each administered by a project leader, project coordinator, or assistant project coordinator.

Programs offered in the Southside Center included: Business Occupations, Health Occupations, and Industrial Occupations. The master plan for the City Colleges projected the development of satellites of the Center in strategically located areas of the city in an effort to respond more directly to the need for vocational/technical education among the academically and economically disadvantaged. The Northside Center will be the first of these satellites to be built.

The Business Occupations Program had 17 training specialists and approximately 250 trainees. Classes were held at both the main campus and at a satellite campus in the downtown area. Equipment was current and up-to-date, thus, allowing trainees to learn using materials comparable to those found in private industry. The Health Occupations Program was staffed by a total of 26 full-time training specialists, three part-time training specialists, three counselors, and three clerks and three supervisors. There were approximately 200 trainees currently enrolled, but the program had the capacity to serve 300 or more.

Much of the program developmental effort at the Center was undertaken through advisory committees. Their specific functions were to advise and counsel the Center supervisory and administrative staffs in the areas of planning and implementation of occupational programs, and to assist and facilitate in the job procurement process for the trainees.

The Center was linked to several governmental agencies including:

- the Mayor's Office of Employment and Training (CETA);
- the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education for the State of Illinois; and
- the Illinois State Bureau of Employment Security.

Additional linkages were maintained by the Department of Student Services with social service agencies in an effort to provide additional services to trainees. Such services were not provided by those government agencies that supported the programs at the Center.

The Department of Student Services coordinated all supportive services in the areas of individual and group counseling, job placement, attendance and recordkeeping, financial aid, student activities and health services. These services were designed to counteract many of the difficulties often preventing students from continuing their education or training. These included insufficient income, poor health care and unemployment.

The Student Services Department at the Center was under the direction of a director. This person was assisted by nine counselors, three placement specialists, one nurse, and seven staff persons in the Attendance and Records Office. Sixteen part-time counselors were also assigned to the Evening Schools of the Adult Learning Skills Program, while a full-time counseling supervisor and five full-time counselors had been assigned to serve students in the community outposts of the same programs.

The Counseling program provided services to students as needed. Areas addressed in counseling, whether on an individual or group basis, were: personal social problems, financial problems, academic and attendance problems and attitudinal/behavioral problems. Counseling services focused on personal social problems related to the training process. Students whose problems were perceived to be too severe or chronic to be addressed adequately by counselors were referred to social services or therapeutic services for in-depth counseling and therapy, as required.

There were nine counselors serving the approximately 800 enrollees in vocational programs. Enrollment at Dawson varied daily because of weekly enrollment and attrition patterns. The maximum capacity of the Center was in excess of 1,100 training positions. Counselors may be responsible for some or all of the trainees in a given program. The Placement Office was responsible for developing job opportunities for trainees who had successfully completed training programs at the Center and had been determined to be job ready. The Office was staffed by two placement specialists whose responsibility was to establish and maintain working relationships with the business and industrial community of Chicago. Although job placement was not guaranteed, every effort was made to provide each trainee with at least three job interviews in his/her occupational area.

Other major services provided at the Center included:

Testing. Upon arrival at the Center, all prospective trainees were administered reading and mathematics tests to assess skill levels for the vocational area of their choice. Applicants were tested with the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), since each training program had minimum achievement levels. Clients who met the minimum admission criteria were scheduled for an interview with the appropriate vocational counselor. Interviewers determined the training readiness status of each client and noted the results of the assessment. Clients were categorized as: "accepted" or "deferred." In the latter status, the client was informed of the supportive or academic services available to prepare them for "accepted" status.

Financial Aid. The Center had consistently offered courses to students free of tuition. In some instances, specifically in the high school completion program, low general fees and material charges were required for specified courses. Financial assistance was also available to students through the payment of stipends to students enrolled under provisions of CETA, through Veterans Benefits under the G.I. Bill, and by means of special public aid allowances.

Adult Learning Skills Program. The task of the Adult Learning Skills Program was to break through the isolation often characteristic of adults who had failed to attain the secondary school diploma. The Program served more than 30,000 adult students who were enrolled in one or more of some 180 different courses and programs offered at 16 evening schools, five special program sites, and more than 400 community outposts located through out the city. Over 13,000 students attended the evening high school classes located in public high school facilities and in the Dawson Skill Center. In addition, more than 1,000 were registered for GED-TV. More than 18,000 students attended the community outpost classes located in churches, libraries, schools, factories, settlement houses, public housing sites, universities and colleges, hospitals, correctional institutions, homes for the aged and mentally impaired, Department of Human Services, Urban Progress Centers, and other similar facilities, the use of which were provided rent-free to the program. Instruction was provided by more than 1,600 training specialists
who were generally assigned on a part-time basis.

Of the students serviced:

- more than 6,000 were enrolled in General Educational Development (GED) Test Preparation;
- over 8,000 participated in English as a Second Language;
- more than 8,000 were enrolled in Adult Basic Education; and
- approximately 11,000 were in a variety of courses offered only in the evening schools and special programs.

Adult Basic Education and General Educational Development classes were provided both in English and in Spanish. The beginning courses in English as a Second Language were frequently staffed by bilingual training specialists who could meet the special needs of speakers of languages such as Spanish, Polish, Chinese, Ukranian, Lithuanian, Korean, French, Japanese, Greek, Hindustani, Arabic, Russian, or any of the Vietnamese language groups.

Courses offered in the evening schools were approved by the Illinois Community College Board, as were those offered in the Community outposts. These courses afforded the student credit toward elementary or high school completion by special arrangement with the Chicago Board of Education. GED-TV provided General Educational Development instruction through television, and although staffed and administered through the Learning Skills Program, represented the cooperative efforts of several institutions including the Chicago Public Library, WTTW TV (Channel 11); the Chicago City-Wide Colleges of the City Colleges of Chicago, and the Educational Service Region of Cook County. The community outpost program was divided into ten regions, each with a regional supervisor and a supporting clerical staff housed in offices usually located within the particular geographic region in which students were serviced. Each regional office was staffed from 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. Monday through Friday. The number of sites varied in a region between 30 to 60 depending upon the region.

Student supportive services, though formerly not available, were now provided to all outpost sites through the assignment of a professional counseling staff to serve the needs of outpost students. These needs were addressed in the past by instructional and administrative staffs.

Other special activities undertaken through the Urban Skills Institute included the learning resource center, the library, the audiovisual center and the reading laboratory. Each is described briefly.

The learning resource center was one of the support units of the Institute. It provided support to the educational and instructional programs of the Institute. It had four operating programs: the Library, the Audiovisual Center, Reading Laboratory and PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations) Laboratory.

The library was responsible for selecting, maintaining, and making accessible to the students and staff a collection of printed resources and materials geared to the goals and objectives of the Institute's programs. Specific collections included the general circulating collection of books, a reference collection, a collection of Illinois college catalogs, a professional collection and a pamphlet and career file.

The Audiovisual Center supplied audiovisual materials and equipment to training specialists, supervisors and administrators. Students also viewed materials in the AV Center, some sent by training specialists to the Center. The PLATO laboratory offers computer-assisted instruction in Math, English, English as a Second Language, Typing, Nursing, Drafting, Machine Shop, as well as other instructional areas. This resource was used by students and trainees on an individual or group basis. Students in the Dawson Center and the Adult Learning Skills Program also used the system that has 14 terminals.

The Reading Laboratory was established in 1977 with Disadvantaged Student Grant Funds and had been refunded annually. The Laboratory serves adult students who would benefit from specialized services in the area of Reading. In addition, students attending the Dawson Center's vocational classes, students in the Adult Learning Skills Program's ABE, GED, and ESL classes, and prospective students for Dawson programs who failed to meet admissions criteria because of low reading scores on standardized tests were serviced by the lab.

b. Environmental Context.

The development of the Chicago Urban Skills Institute began in 1969 and followed two separate paths which interlinked in 1972. One path led some concerned leaders in the City of Chicago to formulate an occupational program for the undereducated, unemployed and underemployed adults who resided in the stockyards' area of the city. This area had been decimated economically by the departure of the meat packing industry and many of the former employees had been without employment for an extended period of time, and required retraining. The other path was one in which many who saw the need and importance of basic education for the same adults: the undereducated, underemployed and unemployed, and the disadvantaged.

The occupational development phase of the Institute began with a $30,000 planning grant from the Economic Development Administration. During the planning stage for a new skill center, a temporary facility was located to house the vocational education program. In the Fall of 1968, the City of

Colleges of Chicago contracted with the Thiokol Corporation to provide training and instruction in Drafting, Typing, Bookkeeping and Stenography. While Thiokol was providing training services for the city colleges, the Chancellor and members of his staff worked with city, state, and federal representatives to develop a permanent facility. The facility was designed as an occupational training center and the City of Chicago received a grant from the Economic Development Administration to build the current facility, the William L. Dawson Skill Center.

While the occupational programs were developing under independent contract, the remedial and basic education components of the program were developed under grants from the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) and the Illinois Department of Public Aid. The result was the Urban Skills Academy, formed in February 1968. The program expanded during the Fall of 1969 to include General Educational Development (GED) Test Preparation and two years later, Title III Adult Basic Education, including English as a Second Language (ESL).

Prior to 1972, the Chicago Board of Education had full administrative responsibility for a program known as Americanization-Urbanization which included ESL and GED. Due to the inability of the Chicago Board of Education to absorb the rising cost of the program, it became evident that if the program and adult education services were to be maintained, the city colleges of Chicago would have to assume major responsibility for the education of adults over the age of 18 who had not attained a secondary school credential.

As these programs began to develop, the need for coordination to insure their continued growth and to maintain their effectiveness became apparent. In the Spring of 1972, the Chicago Skill Center became a reality, and one year later the Chicago Skill Center moved into its permanent facility. The Dawson Skill Center had already been designated by the Department of Labor as the official skill center. It was during this period that the Americanization-Urbanization program was changed to the Adult Learning Skills Program and because of the expansiveness of the program and the need for effective management, the city was divided into seven regions for administrative purposes. When the Chicago Board of Education again experienced finanical problems, it requested the City Colleges of Chicago to assume total responsibility for its adult evening high school programs.

With the opening of the fall 1973 semester, the Chicago Skill Center had two major components: the William L. Dawson Skill Center, that provided occupational training for the unemployed and others, and the Adult Learning Skills Program, that provided evening high school as well as evening GED, ESL, and ABE classes.

In February 1974, the Chicago Skill Center was recognized by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board as a community college. In July 1974, the name of the Chicago Skill Center was changed to the Chicago Urban Skills Institute to reflect the evolving purpose and mission of its programs.

Although the Chicago Urban Skills Institute does not grant post-secondary degrees, it does award appropriate certificates to individuals completing programs. Graduates of all programs who are capable of mastering skills more complex than those required for entry level employment are encouraged to continue their training in the city colleges of Chicago or at other institutions of higher education.

c. Effects and Problems Related to Collaborative Effort.

The Chicago Urban Skills Center Institute enrolled over 31,000 students during the Spring, 1979 term. This total included 14,639 men and 16,490 women. The ethnic and age breakdowns of the student body were:

Ethnicity/Race:	
Black (Non-Hispanic)	12,545
American Indian	154
White (Non-Hispanic)	4,417
Asian or Pacific Islander	549
Hispanic	7,528
Unknown (No information offered) and Other	5,981
Total	31,129

Age	
16-24	25%
25-34	55%
35-44	10%
45-54	7%
55-64	2%
65 and older	1%

The Institute has been experiencing a slight decline in enrollment since

1976. Enrollments in the various programs for the past three years were as follows:

	1976	1977	1978	1979
Evening High School	14,590	13,796	13,437	13,076
Outposts/Alternative High Schools, GED-TV, Dawson Skill Center	22,371	18,874	18,715	19,424
Total	36,961	32,670	31,152	32,500

The instructional staff at the Institute was composed of 81 full-time instructors and more than 1600 part-time instructors. There were an additional 60 administrative staff members, including administrators, directors, coordinators, supervisors, and administrative assistants, as well as 30 supportive staff.

Full-time staff were compensated at a competitive annual salary, with fringe and professional benefits. Part-time staff were paid on an hourly basis, determined according to experience, education, and length of tenure.

The delivery system developed by the Urban Skills Institute had enabled the Institute to meet its mission of providing educational opportunity to the sizable academically and economically disadvantaged population residing in the community college district. This was demonstrated by the Institute's ability to maintain enrollment levels at or above 30,000 persons per year since its inception.

Administrators, faculty and instructional staff of the Institute were involved in development, planning and implementation of their respective programs at a level that had been recognized and acknowledged by the Illinois Community College Board. Additionally, the Institute's One and Five Year Plans had identified and addressed the various global and specific programmatic problems that needed to be addressed in order to enable it to pursue its mission of making "equal educational opportunity" a reality for the disadvantaged adult populations.

The major problems confronting the Institute, as stated in its own

Self-Study [2] were:

Delivery of Services and Coordination of Services. As a college within a college system, there was need for coordination of services both across and within the colleges. This problem was particularly acute for the Institute, since its major programs had satellite centers, established specifically to insure proximity of services to the target clients. Satellite centers presented problems in terms of services delivery costs. Already, some smaller centers had been terminated and/or were combined into larger ones. As costs for educational services delivery continued to escalate, the Institute needed to address the trade off between maintaining its programs in a cost/effective manner and being able to outreach and service the disadvantaged.

Quality of Instructional Staff. The Institute was nontraditional, and therefore had no tenure track for its faculty. While it had been fortunate in attracting well qualified and committed instructional staff, it had increasing difficulty in retaining some of its training specialists, many of whom could earn higher salaries in private industry. Indeed, this was a problem facing many vocational/occupational programs and institutions that provided those services, as private industrial salaries and wage scale became more competitve, especially in the highly-technical areas, and in some social and human services delivery areas.

Effectivieness of Instructional Modalities. Because of the variety of academic and social problems that the target population brought to the educational setting, the Institute had to grapple with the need to develop instructional services in addition to occupational training. These services were needed to make its programs more effective and to increase the potential for its trainees despite the variety of obstacles present.

Utilization of Research for Problem Solving. Current research and evaluation efforts at the Institute tended to be after the fact. There was a need for the Institute to make better application of research and evaluation for formative purposes, so as to undertake planning, design and implementation activities at a higher level of efficiency and quality. Such undertaking could do much to enable the Institute to address the problems listed above in a more effective manner.

---

[2] Report of the Institutional Self-Study, Vol. I, (Chicago: Chicago Urban Skills Instutute, October, 1979), throughout the entire text of the report.

7. Industry/Education Council, Dutchess County, New York.

a. Description of Arrangement.

The Industry/Education Council consisted of eleven community representatives of local business, industry, unions and education in Dutchess County, New York. Funded by the New York State Department of Education under a VEA grant to Dutchess County Community College, its major objectives were:

- to improve the economic climate of Dutchess County;
- to provide an informational forum to the community at large, and to the county's secondary and post-secondary school-age youth, in particular, on the realities of the transition from education to work;
- to bring about the merger of the Industry Education Council with the CETA sponsored Private Industry Council; and,
- to establish internships and cooperative education experiences for the county secondary and post-secondary education students.

Starting in December 1979, even before its commencement, discussions had been underway to explore the desirability of the merger between the Industry/Education Council and the Dutchess County CETA Private Industry Council. The merger finally occurred in June 1980. Major activities sponsored by the Council had received financial support primarily from two funding sources: VEA and CETA. All activities sponsored were those deemed by the Council to be essential to meeting any or all of the four major objectives of the Council.

The Council was represented by members from the following sectors of the community:

Business and Industry:

- Chamber of Commerce
- Large businesses--IBM, the largest employer in the area
- Intermediate business--Western Publishing Company and Standard Gage Company
- Small businesses--IMS Construction Company and CEM Printing and Reproductions, Inc.

Financial Institutions: Dutchess Bank

Unions: Association of Hispanicos Unitos de Beacon and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

The State Employment Service

Education: Secondary-Arlington School District

Post-secondary: Dutchess County Community College

Each sector had an equal voice in determining the major policies and projects to be undertaken by the Council. All decisions were voted on by Council members in attendance; the rule of majority applied for decisions and was binding on the Council. The staff work for the Council was undertaken by an executive director and supportive personnel. It was the function of the office of the executive director to make recommendations to the Council regarding funding opportunities available for projects, and to implement the decisions made by the Council. The director also acted as project manager in the implementation of the council activities.

At its present stage of development, the Council had assumed the major role of identifying gaps in services delivery and training/education in the Hudson Valley area. Its primary focus had been the issue of the economic growth of the county.

The economic position of the area had been declining due to two interrelated conditions. First, local industry, which had enjoyed a great deal of stability for many decades, was now on the decline because industry had failed to insure continuity of its skilled labor force. Once known as the "Gauge Capital of the World," the Hudson Valley area had been a leader in the manufacture of small machines. In the past, the skills required for the industry were passed on from father to son. However, in recent years, younger generations had opted to acquire skills and education in other occupational areas. This had resulted in an aging labor force and few prospects for replacements. The Council was concerned about the economic impact on the area should these small businesses fold.

The second concern of the Council was retaining young adults for the labor force in the county. The Hudson Valley area had been viewed by young adults as an area to leave rather than one in which to remain. This was despite the fact that IBM, the largest employer in the area, offered exceptional employment oportunities. The Council felt that it could play a role in educating secondary and post-secondary youth with regard to the employment opportunities existing in the area. By doing so, it hoped to be able to retain a significant number of youth so as to stabilize the labor force in the area. Thus, another major set of activities had been those related to the career/vocational education development of secondary and post-secondary school-age youth. The Council had supported two major projects since its inception: CETA sponsored program to train machinists for local industry and an internship staff development program for high school guidance counselors. Each is described separately below.

Industrial Training Program for Skilled Machinists. The Council had established a project to provide two training programs: one at the entry level and one at the intermediate level, to increase the local labor pool of skilled machinists. This program was developed under the sponsorship of the Poughkeepsie Area Chamber of Commerce with the support and direct participation of the presidents of three of the County's manufacturing companies and the personnel department of a large publishing company. The program was designed to meet current and projected employment needs of these and 45 additional companies surveyed by the Chamber. The Industry/ Educational Council members and the Director of the Dutchess County CETA Program agreed that special programs were needed for CETA clients if they were to compete for places in this training program. The project, eventually funded by CETA, linked together several agencies: the Industry/Education Council, the Mid-Hudson Institute for Community Design for the Young, the Dutchess County CETA youth Division, the Dutchess County Youth Employment Service, Dutchess County Community College, and the Dutchess County BOCES, in a program to screen selected CETA clients for machinist aptitude, and to provide them with special training and work experiences to make them competitive for places in the Entry Level Machinist Training Program.

The CETA elegible clients selected for the project were youths between the ages of 17 and 21; some were in school, some had graduated and others had dropped out. The Council noted in its deliberations prior to the inception of the project that rarely did the youth served by the Dutchess County CETA Youth Division and the Dutchess County Youth Employment Service (the agencies that recruited the participants) have clearly defined career goals. Often the youths lacking employment skills also needed attitudinal adjustment to obtain successfully and to sustain employment of any kind. In the county, the youth employment rate had consistently been above 15 percent, and, according to county data for minority and disadvantaged youth, it had exceeded 30 percent. The project provided participants with paid work experiences in addition to skills training and placement assistance.

The Council saw the project as a means of demonstrating that with proper preparation, CETA clients could compete for places in private sector training programs leading directly to gainful employment. Local industry, the Council argued, had legitimate reservations about employing people from CETA and the Council felt that such concerns could be met by demonstration projects of this type. The success of the project was in part due to the linkages that were established. These included:

- The Dutchess County CETA youth Division would fund the Mid-Hudson Institute for Community Design for the Young for the support of the work experience at one of its Career Action learning Modules; the Mid-Hudson Institute would design and construct community facilities related to improving the quality of life for the young. During the summer, remodeling and renovation of several structures would begin on a 7.6 acre site in the City of Poughkeepsie that was being developed as a multi-service center campus for agencies serving disadvantaged youth.

- The Industry/Education Council would subcontract with the Mid-Hudson Institute for the provision of the basic manual skills training program and the Machinist Training Preparedness Program.

- The Dutchess County Youth Employment Service, a federally funded 70,001 program, would work with the CETA Youth Division to screen applicants for the project guaranteeing that they met CETA guidelines; the Youth Employment Service would also provide needed supervision for its clients who participated, as well as placement services for all participants.

- Where appropriate, training would be sponsored by the Dutchess Community College Office of Continuing Education and Community Services and the Dutchess County BOCES.

The program was established during the 1979-80 school year. Funding was secured from Dutchess County CETA, and the program became operational that year. The participants in the entry Level Machinist Program took instruction at the Dutchess County BOCES facility. Successful participants received a certificate and became eligible for the intermediate Level Machinist Program. When they completed the intermediate level program, they were eligible to receive certification from the Dutchess County Community College.

The High School Guidance Counselor Internships in Local Employment Project. Another concern of the Council was the quality of employment guidance students in local high schools were receiving from school personnel. The needs assessment undertaken by the staff of the Council indicated that many guidance counselors had limited knowledge of the job seeking problems of youth. Indeed, there was considerable evidence that school personnel had limited skills in assisting youth in the development of employability skills critical to undertaking employment searches. The Council developed a project to provide internships for high school guidance counselors in local employment. If funded, the project would establish a one-year experimental program of internships for three high school guidance counselors, one from each of the school districts of Poughkeepsie, Hyde Park, and another to be determined. Each counselor selected would spend three months in the State Office of Employment Services, three months at a large industrial site and three months in the Office of County Government.

The internship was especially designed so that:

- Counselors could identify the employment opportunities and the problems faced by youth as they sought employment in each of the three settings described for the internship.
- Additional training would be provided related to the acquisition and use of Department of Labor and local employment data.
- Counselors would spend one month working with their school principal and the head of their Guidance Department to restructure his or her job so that upon return from the internship they would counsel the key individuals in the schools providing career and employment advisement to students.

Funding was requested from the CETA-sponsored Private Industry Council, and at the time of the visit by researchers, the decision regarding the request was pending.

b. Outcomes/Problems Related to the Collaborative Effort.

Outcomes of the programs and projects of the Council were not clear since the Council had been in existence for just over a year and only one major project had been established at the time of the site visit--the Entry level and Intermediate Level Training Programs for Skilled Machinists.

What the Council had been able to accomplish, however, which portends well for the area, were the following:

- A mechanism for overall needs assessment and planning in the areas of employment needs and delivery of services through existing organizations to meet these needs.
- Credibility with the various sectors in the area including private employers and public service providers.
- Provision of information about career/employment opportunities to school-aged youth through a variety of activities directed to them, e.g., the proposed high school guidance counselor internship project and participation in Job Fairs/Career Days.
- The merger of the Industry/Education Council with the CETA-sponsored Private Industry Council.